TRANSLATIONS
OF
CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

THE TREATISE OF NOVATIAN ON THE TRINITY

HERBERT MOORE M.A.

Please return this book to *moi!*
THIS BOOK BELONGS TO
Patricia Wilson - Kastner
© Henson Associates, Inc. 1981, 1989

TRANSLATIONS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

SERIES II

LATIN TEXTS

THE TREATISE OF NOVATIAN "ON THE TRINITY"

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/treatiseofnovati0000herb

TRANSLATIONS OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE . SERIES II
LATIN TEXTS

THE TREATISE OF NOVATIAN ON THE TRINITY

By HERBERT MOORE M.A.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE. London
The Macmillan Company. New York
1919

BT
110
.N6813
1919

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	7
	PART I.—OF GOD THE FATHER	
I.	GOD THE CREATOR	21
II.	THE INFINITY OF GOD . . .	25
III.	SOME SCRIPTURAL DESCRIPTIONS OF GOD	28
IV.	GOD IS GOOD, CHANGELESS, SUPREME, ONE, NAMELESS	31
V.	GOD IS INCORRUPTIBLE, IN SPITE OF CERTAIN SCRIPTURE EXPRESSIONS .	35
VI.	THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC LANGUAGE OF SCRIPTURE	37
VII.	THE TERM "SPIRIT" AS APPLIED TO GOD .	40
VIII.	THE MAJESTY AND PROVIDENCE OF GOD	42
	PART II.—OF GOD THE SON	
IX.	THE SON PROMISED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND REVEALED IN THE NEW .	45
X.	THE DOCETIC CHRIST	48
XI.	CHRIST: THE SON OF GOD, AND THE SON OF MAN	52
XII.	OLD TESTAMENT PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST	56
XIII.	NEW TESTAMENT PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST	60
XIV.	FURTHER SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST . . .	64
XV.	FURTHER SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF CHRIST'S DIVINITY, CONSIDERED AT GREATER LENGTH	67

CHAP.		PAGE
XVI.	FURTHER SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST	72
XVII.	THE TESTIMONY OF MOSES	77
XVIII.	FURTHER TESTIMONY OF MOSES: "THE ANGEL"	80
XIX.	OTHER APPEARANCES OF "THE ANGEL"	87
XX.	THE NAME OF GOD IS GRANTED TO ANGELS AND TO MEN	92
XXI.	THE LANGUAGE OF THE GOSPELS AND EPISTLES	94
XXII.	ST. PAUL'S LANGUAGE IN PHILIPPIANS II. EXAMINED	99
XXIII.	HERESY ITSELF A PROOF OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST	103
XXIV.	HERETICAL VIEWS EXAMINED	105
XXV.	CHRIST'S DEATH NO DISPROOF OF HIS GODHEAD	109
XXVI.	THE HERETICAL VIEW THAT CHRIST IS GOD THE FATHER	112
XXVII.	IN WHAT SENSE CHRIST AND THE FATHER ARE "ONE"	115
XXVIII.	SEEING THE FATHER IN CHRIST	119

PART III.—OF GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT

XXIX.	THE UNITY AND THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT	124

PART IV.—OF THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD

XXX.	THE GODHEAD OF CHRIST DOES NOT IMPAIR THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD	130
XXXI.	CONCLUSION	134
	INDEX OF SUBJECTS	141
	INDEX OF TEXTS	145

THE TREATISE OF NOVATIAN "ON THE TRINITY"

INTRODUCTION

I. *Novatian and the Novatianists*

Novatian (called by Greek writers, who do not distinguish him from Novatus of Carthage, Νοονάτος, Ναυάτος, or Ναβάτος) was a presbyter of the Roman Church in the middle of the third century.[1] He had been trained in the Stoic philosophy, and was apparently not converted until he reached manhood. It was said in disparagement of him that he had been baptized on a sick bed and had not, at least on that occasion, been confirmed. As a leading presbyter at Rome he enjoyed a great reputation. Pope Cornelius speaks of him as "this remarkable man," "this most illustrious man."

In the year A.D. 250, Fabian, the Bishop of Rome, was martyred; for natural reasons of prudence, the See was not filled for fifteen months, its affairs being managed by the fifty-three clergy of Rome. Among these, Novatian's abilities had won him such a high position, that he was appointed to issue letters in their name, and seemed likely to be the next bishop. But the choice of the clergy fell upon Cornelius. Hereupon,

[1] This account is drawn from Cornelius's letter in Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 43; Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 28, and Cyprian's letters about Novatian.

a strong minority persuaded Novatian to accept consecration, from three Italian bishops, as a rival bishop; the question dividing the two parties being one which involved the whole disciplinary powers of the Church—"the power of the keys."

As the Church is a great society, it has the right to expel any members who break its rules of conduct or of faith, and also to readmit them on its conditions of repentance and amendment being fulfilled; this power it exercises through its officers, the bishops and priests. Excommunicated persons had long before Novatian's time been so readmitted, at least when at the point of death, and the principle was gradually widened, so that even those who had been grievous sinners, and were in no danger of death, could again enjoy Church privileges; while the power of granting readmission was extended to "Confessors"—those who had stood firm for Christ during persecution.[1] But there always was a strong body of opinion in the Church that grievous sins, including apostasy from the faith, could not be absolved, but must be left to God's uncovenanted mercies.

Now in the persecution which began under Decius, many had escaped martyrdom by offering incense to the heathen gods or surrendering their sacred books, and when it ceased desired to be accepted again as Church members, offering to do penance or obtaining letters from Confessors. Cyprian of Carthage, the ablest bishop of the time, at first held that the Church could not readmit such persons, though he himself had avoided martyrdom by flight; but afterwards he adopted

[1] A martyr would leave behind a letter interceding for some one, to which weight would naturally be attached. The Confessors, who were willing to die though the supreme sacrifice had not been demanded of them, claimed the privileges of martyrs.

the milder view. To exclude men for ever from the Church, he said, means to anticipate God's judgment and deny His mercy. Let the lapsed or sinful Christian be absolved, and readmitted after due penance, leaving it to God to rectify any mistake. The tares must ever be mingled with the wheat.

Nay, said Novatian's party. The Church is a body of saints, and saints only. The admission of a sinner defiles her and spreads contagion. To keep her pure, grievous sinners must be permanently excluded; the few must suffer for the good of the many.

Thus Novatian adopted an impossible ideal of a perfectly pure Church, and his sect received the name Cathari, or Puritans; and like modern Puritans, who have left the Church as falling short of their ideal of a community composed only of holy persons, they took a severe view of what constitutes sinfulness, condemning many things which the Church regarded as being inevitable and innocent accompaniments of our life on earth.

This was in part due to the influence of the African writer Tertullian. The characteristic of the African Church was a certain gloomy severity; Tertullian's legal training had predisposed him in this direction, and he used his great powers of argument, sarcasm and invective, to urge his views. Novatian's writings, in style, doctrine and general view of the meaning of Christianity, show him to have been a great admirer of Tertullian; and as in all parts of the Christian world there were many who held his views of a perfectly pure Church, his sect made rapid headway. He was excommunicated by a synod of bishops, but the Cathari maintained that they, and not the others, were the true, the pure Church. They continued to exist under their own bishops for some three hundred and fifty years, and then passed

away. The sect was especially strong in Phrygia. Nothing is known of Novatian's later life; he is said to have suffered martyrdom under Valerian in 257.

II. *Literary Activity*

Novatian, according to Jerome (*De Vir. Illustr.* 70) "wrote, *On the Passover, On the Sabbath, On Circumcision, On the Priesthood, On Prayer, On the Food of the Jews, On Zeal, On Attalus,* and many others, especially a great volume, *On the Trinity,* a sort of epitome of the work of Tertullian, which many mistakenly ascribe to Cyprian." Jerome also speaks of a collection of Novatian's letters (*Ep.* x. 3). Novatian addressed circular letters to the Church on subjects connected with his schism, and two of his letters appear among Cyprian's (xxxi. and xxxv.). The preservation of a heresiarch's writings is due to their inclusion among the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian. *De Cibis Judaicis* and *De Trinitate* were ascribed to Tertullian, and some of the Cyprianic collection are now believed to have been written by Novatian, especially *De bono Pudicitiæ* and *De Spectaculis.* The dates of his treatises are unknown, but *De Trinitate* was probably written well before 250, and was the cause of his high reputation.

III. *De Trinitate*

It is hard to believe that the author of the treatise *On the Trinity* was simply an ambitious schemer, who adopted a popular theory to secure his own advancement. We may give him credit for having acted from the same zeal for the good of the Church and the glory of God which had led him previously to use his great abilities as a writer to explain the Catholic faith, his devotion to which was perfectly sincere. Religious speculations, some wild and fanciful, others deeply

philosophical, were abroad in abundance, springing mostly from Greek or Eastern thinkers. Without the Church, some of these teachers tried to incorporate Christian elements into their systems; while within, men who professed the faith had allowed these speculations to draw them from the faith as the Church understood it, into forms of opinion which the Church called heresy. Tertullian, in Africa, had written various treatises to purge the faith from these erroneous ideas, and to explain what it really is; Novatian decided to do the same at Rome. He is the first great Roman writer; great, not only in his powers of thought, but in the cultured style, based upon his study of the best Latin authors, which he was able to devote to the expression of it.

"Heresy" properly means "choosing"; choosing some point or aspect of the Christian faith, and insisting upon it to the exclusion of others; or choosing an interpretation of Christian teaching which is not in accordance with the Scriptures and tradition of the Church. The Catholic faith, as we know it, is the result of centuries of thought, discussion and spiritual and practical experience. Church Councils have been held, at which doubtful matters have been decided; we know what the voice of the Church is upon all important matters of the faith. But in Novatian's time, the faith was still in a more or less fluid state; points which were settled in future generations were open questions. It was not from wilfulness, but from ignorance or from misconception, that many, often with the best intentions, accepted or taught heresy.

There were two standards by which an opinion professing to be Christian might be tested: the Church's Scriptures, and the Church's tradition and worship. For there always was a Church tradition, handed down

side by side with the Scriptures as a guide for her members; the limit of the contents of Holy Scripture itself (the "Canon of Scripture"), and the observance of Sunday, are parts of this tradition. New Testament writers, as well as those of less authority of the first centuries of Christianity, constantly appeal to it. When Church Councils were held, their purpose was not to lay down anything new, but to find out and register what the Church tradition was in different parts of the Christian world, and therefore derived from a common source of truth, as opposed to opinions which were merely local and temporary.

This Church tradition had crystallized, in regard to the central points of the faith, into "forms of sound words," "symbols," "rules of faith" (as Novatian calls them), used especially in the instruction of candidates for Baptism, and varying in different parts of the Church; none so long as our "Apostles' Creed," but all containing an expression of faith in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. As used by Novatian, the framework of the "rule of faith" seems to have been this: "I believe in God the Father and Almighty Lord; and in the Son of God, Christ Jesus, our Lord God; I believe also in the Holy Spirit."

In the first ages, men were content with this formula as containing sufficient for their souls' need, without inquiring more deeply into its meaning. The pressure of persecution compelled such writers as arose to defend the Church against charges of cruelty, immorality, disloyalty, and the like. But when they began to inquire, they found themselves faced with the most profound questions—philosophical, metaphysical, and psychological. No Church Council had been held to guide them by its decisions, and the language was lacking in which to express the answers which they might feel the questions to require. Is this expression of faith com-

parable to such an illogical assertion as, "I believe in God, in Socrates, and in Nature"? Or are there three Gods in Christian belief? What is meant by the term "Son of God"?

The efforts to answer these problems led to heresy on the part of those who ignored, or were ignorant of, or misconceived Christian tradition; but as astrology led through paths of error to astronomy, so did the conflict of Christian belief with heretical error lead to Christian theology. Most of the heretics laid claim to a special "knowledge" (*gnosis*, St. Paul's word in 1 Cor. viii.), by which they could attain to an insight into the mysteries of God beyond the powers of other men.

The Christians spoke of God the Father, a term used also by non-Christians of the "Artificer of the Universe." But how are we to account for the existence of suffering, pain, evil—the world-old question which in the Far East gave rise to Buddhism? Creation is a descent from spirit to matter, from better to worse. It seemed necessary to find something between the Absolute Godhead and this crass and evil matter; certain sects therefore taught that there was an inferior god, called *the demiurge*, or a chain of beings called *æons* emanating from God, one of whom was at last foolish or bad enough to create matter. Others, examining the Old Testament, without discerning that it was produced in varying stages in the development of human thought and meditation, maintained that the God of the Old Testament could not be the God of the New. Novatian's Stoic friends spoke of "nature"; "Jupiter is whatever you see, wherever you go."

The "rule of faith" used by Novatian possibly contained the word "One" in its first clause: if it did not, every instructed Church Christian would know that it was implied. At once the next term, "Son of God,"

aroused inquiry. How could God have a Son? "Jesus" is a common Jewish name; how can a man who bore it be ranked with the One God as an object of belief? Certain features marked Him off as different from other men; how were these to be accounted for? Who and what was He?

He was a man, some said, who lived such a holy life, that Christ came upon him at his baptism, or, that he was then made God. Others explained that the term "Son of God" was a title of the One Father God, under a special manifestation, a mode of His Being. Others understood that St. John's doctrine of "the Word" described a mode of operation of this One God; Who therefore it was that lived in Palestine, and suffered and died upon the Cross. Then there were those who urged that God could not have taken flesh upon Him, as flesh was too vile to be brought into such close relationship with God; the Christ of the Gospels was an appearance or phantom, who was crucified while the real Son of God looked on from the Mount of Olives. His redeeming work was to undo the great mistake of creation. Thus while some denied His Godhead, others denied His Manhood; while some explained away His Manhood, others made His Godhead to be that of the Father.

In regard to the third clause of "the rule of faith," inquiry had scarcely arisen when Novatian wrote, and his discussion of the work and Personality of the Holy Spirit is therefore brief and lacking in definiteness. The bulk of the treatise deals with Jesus Christ, recognized as man, yet also the Son of God, and God. Novatian's task was to show Him to be such, yet without traversing the statement of the first clause, "God is One." Here arose a further difficulty. There hardly existed the vocabulary by which to express the thoughts of Christians upon so profound a subject. The New Testament,

which all were agreed in accepting as the test of truth, was written in Greek; so long as Greek Testament words alone were used, the language at least could not be erroneous. But words change their meaning, and heretics misused New Testament language to support their views. It was inevitable that words not in the Greek Testament should be employed, even in Greek; and as the faith spread more and more widely, it was necessary to find Latin terms corresponding not only to the Greek words of the New Testament, but also to those which Greek theologians were using to clarify and define the true meaning of Christian belief.

In this respect Novatian had the advantage of following Tertullian, the first great Christian writer in Latin. He, too, had set before himself the task of explaining the creed in such a way as neither to posit three gods, nor to evacuate the Son of His Godhead. "They are three," but three—what? The New Testament does not supply the word needed, even in Greek; Tertullian boldly went beyond the language of Scripture, and taking the vernacular word for "a character in a play," corresponding to a Greek word of similar derivation, answered "Three *Persons*." In the same way he borrowed from the ordinary language of the day terms to express the mysteries of the Divine Nature and the attributes of God, most of which the Church was able to accept. Yet we feel, as we read Novatian's treatise, that he is struggling to express thoughts for which the language at his command was not sufficient, that he is continually feeling his way to the discovery of the right word among many which are more or less synonymous,[1] and that the sense in which he employs a word is not always the same.

But if the Church had not yet found her way to a satisfactory theological vocabulary, much less had she

[1] See Index, "Union," p. 107, n. 2.

thought out a sound theological system. It was no longer enough for the Christian to say, in his simplicity, "I believe in Christ, the Saviour of the world." He is Saviour, because He is the Son of God, and God; but in what sense God? Novatian devotes most of his treatise to showing that He is God. He had the old standards of appeal—"we know, and read, and believe, and hold"; the Scriptures, and the consciousness of the Church expressed in Church tradition. As we should expect from one who held his views of Church authority, he lays most weight upon the authority of Holy Scripture. Some of his applications of its words, from the Old Testament especially, may seem to us extravagant. But the spoken teaching of apostle or bishop may be incorrectly reported; "the written word remains." It is "given by inspiration of God"; it is "they that testify of" Christ. No wonder that such veneration was given to the Scriptures, that every word was regarded as inspired, without consideration of the different purposes for which different parts are inspired; and as it was agreed that "the New Testament lies hidden in the Old, the Old Testament lies open in the New" (as St. Augustine afterwards expressed it), every word in the Old Testament was considered to be applicable directly to Christ. When a statement concerning Him is "proved" by a passage from Scripture, the verdict is final. More, it is God who "proves" the truth by the mouth of His prophets, who speak in His Name.

We must not expect to find in Novatian's treatise a final answer to all the great questions which it raises in the effort to meet error. It was impossible for any one writer to anticipate the outcome of centuries of thought and inquiry; or for any one writer to speak in the name of the whole Church. The book is valuable as showing the opinions of an able writer at a particular stage in the

development of Christian understanding ; but sometimes the language is unguarded and dangerously near to heresy. Indeed, it is probable, and traditions found in writers of the time suggest that it is true, that the survival of the writings of such a schismatic is due, not only to their good fortune in being attributed to accepted Church authors, but also to the efforts of heretics to preserve them as supporting their views.

"The Word, as Reason," said Tertullian, "lay immanent in the Father's bosom, but was uttered and came forth for the purposes of Creation." "Christ is not man only," says Novatian, "but God ; yet God as the Son of God." What is the difference? He is "born of God," He "has His origin in the Father," He is "born when the Father willed," He is "after the Father" (though God is "timeless"), He is "obedient and subject to the Father," He is "less than the Father." Yet He is God. How can Infinite God be less than Infinite God? And He is man, through "commingling of the Divine Nature with human nature." What is the difference between Divine and human nature? What is the "Divinity" which Christ gives, "through immortality," to man?

Novatian does not find any difficulty in the psychological question ; he takes it as understood that the two natures are as distinct as two fluids which can be poured into one receptacle. In regard to the theological question, he says that Christ is God, but not in His Own right, only by gift from the Father, Who is the Source of all being ; there is an eternal interchange of Godhead between the two Holy Persons. He emphasizes the derivative and the subordinate nature of the Godhead of the Son, in his anxiety to avoid the suggestion that there are two Gods, and the alternative that the Son is less than God, and only the Son of Man.

Had the Son borne the name and attributes of the Father in His own right, there must be two Gods; therefore all must be given to Him of the Father, the one gift which the Father cannot bestow being His own attribute of causelessness. He alone is "without origin," "without beginning."

Is the existence, then, of the Son due to an act of will on the part of God the Father? Did He not exist from all eternity, or was there "a time when the Son was not?" Does subordination imply inferiority? To our finite intelligences, hedged in by human language, it would seem so. Yet our souls instinctively feel that we do not mean this in our thoughts of God. Later generations condemned Novatian's implication that the generation of the Son was an act of the Father's will; all words to express the mystery of the Sonship were forbidden except the scriptural term "generation," and that with the connotation of eternity which the Church read into it, welcoming Origen's phrase, "the eternal generation of the Son." And by "eternity" is meant not time, but life; while as for "will," it was declared that will, in the human sense, as an arbitrary and contingent faculty, is not predicable of God, any more than time can be reckoned in the relationship between the Holy Persons. Obviously, the principle may be extended to all such words, such as "giving," "sending forth," used as though God was such a Being as ourselves. We have to use them; but their meaning is not limited to the human interpretation of them.

Even so, such an expression as "the Son is less than the Father" is not fully explained. Human thought had to reach further than was possible in the early centuries of Church history; and we know now that the reconciliation of the apparent antithesis is to be found, if ever in this world, in the nature of Personality. Even

now we know little of the ultimate meaning of human personality, though we recognize in it a unity in diversity of desire, intellect and will. Our conception of it is exclusive, rather than comprehensive. Divine personality, which we need not shrink from admitting to be beyond our powers of thought, much more of expression, must transcend human personality. Indeed, true personality can exist only in God. We cannot avoid speaking of one who carries out the will of another, because his will is identical with that other's, as "obedient," or of one who receives a gift as being "less than" that other. In the unity of God there can be no such thought; if the word "thought" can be used at all of God. The personality of God, a higher unity in diversity than that of man, will never be "known" until "we see face to face."

What am I?
An infant crying in the night:
An infant crying for the light,
And with no language but a cry.

Meanwhile we are content and thankful to "walk by faith, and not by sight," whether physical or mental.

Novatian had studied Latin classical and philosophical writers, especially Cicero, Virgil and Seneca; and his style, in diction and rhythm, is of the best. He is fond of balancing sentences; some of his rhetorical outbursts, and his metaphors and illustrations, are admirable. It is not easy to translate his treatise into readable English, which is really English and not Latin in English words, owing to its compression of much thought into few words, its long sentences, composed of many clauses, ntroduced by "since," "although," etc., and its constant use of syllogisms. "For," "therefore," "consequently," occur continually; we are conscious that we are dealing with a student of logic and of law. I have broken

up the long sentences and frequently omitted the conjunctions; I should have liked to omit many of the tiresome repetitions (*e.g.* in chaps. xii. and xiii.), by which he makes his arguments more clear with exaggerated carefulness. I have also added headings to the paragraphs as a help to reference. I trust that, though I have not tried to give a literal translation, I have not obscured any shade of thought expressed in the original. Those who want a literal version can find it in the *Ante-Nicene Library*, among Cyprian's writings. The present version is meant to convey the sense of the original, even at the cost of an occasional paraphrase. Where the rendering seems to exceed the limits of legitimate paraphrase, words added to complete the sense, but not represented in the original, are put in italics.

IV. *Editions*

The standard edition is Jackson's (London, 1728), upon which Migne's is founded. It remains for me to express my obligations, and those of the Church, to the work of the Rev. W. Y. Fausset (*Novatian, de Trinitate*, Cambridge, 1909), who has provided an introduction, notes and indices which no one who wishes to know more of the treatise should fail to read. He was not able to contribute much to the improvement of the text. "Up to the present," he says, "Jackson has spoken the last word. . . . It is difficult to see how any substantial improvement can be made in the text, until some fortunate scholar lights upon a manuscript of merit." If ever I have departed from the rendering of so good a scholar, it has been in the hope of making the meaning more clear, or the language more homely, for the benefit of those who have not studied theology or are not familiar with Latin.

PART I.—OF GOD THE FATHER

CHAPTER I

GOD THE CREATOR

The Grandeur, Beneficence, and Beauty of Creation

THE rule of truth[1] requires that we believe, first, in God the Father[2] and Lord Almighty, that is to say, the most perfect Founder of all things.

He made the sky, poised above in its lofty height, the solid mass of earth laid out beneath, the seas flowing freely in every direction; and He furnished all these, in full abundance and order, with their peculiar and suitable agencies. In the firmament of heaven He set the sun, aroused at each day's dawn to give light with his beams; the brilliant sphere of the moon, waxing to fullness with her monthly phases, to relieve the gloom of night; and

[1] Every society must have its rules; in the Christian society the rules will be of conduct (Gal. vi. 16) and of faith. The Greek word is *Canon*, "a rod," "a mason's rule," "a limit" (2 Cor. xi. 16), "a defined list" (*e.g.* of sacred books). The Apostles would naturally agree upon the main points of their message (Acts i. 21; x. 34, etc.), and those who wished to join the Society were taught "a form of sound words" (2 Tim. i. 13), at first brief, but gradually enlarged, based on our Lord's words in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. In chaps. xvi., xxvi., Nov. uses the word "rule" of statements of our Lord Himself. Our "Apostles' Creed" is one of several "rules of faith" used in the Western Church for the instruction of candidates for Baptism; it is possible that this treatise may be based on the original formula from which our Creed was enlarged, to be found, at least in part, in the opening words of chaps. i., ix., xxix.

[2] "Father" is used in Greek and Latin pagan writers of the Creator of the world and the Ruler of men. The earliest Christian writers use it in the same sense, but beyond question employ it also in the specific Christian sense of "The Father of God the Son," "The Fount of Deity," as later theologians described Him.

the glittering stars, shining with rays of varying degrees of intensity. It is by His will that they run their courses according to the laws of their orbits, to mark for mankind days, months, years, and seasons,[1] and to be for signs and other useful purposes. On the earth, too, He reared the mountains with their towering crests, hollowed out the deep valleys, levelled the plains, and appointed the different species of animals, to supply the various needs of man. He hardened the stout timber of the forests to serve man's purposes, called forth the fruits of the earth for food, unlocked the mouths of gushing springs, and poured them forth to swell the gliding rivers.

Further, He failed not to provide our eyes with their feast of beauty, but clothed the whole face of the earth with flowers of every hue, for the delight of all who see them. In the sea, again, wonderful as it is in its extent and in its usefulness to man, He fashions living creatures of all sorts, some of moderate, some of enormous size, bearing witness by their variety to the skill of the Artificer Who appointed them. Even this was not enough; the roaring billows and currents of waters might have encroached upon a domain which is not theirs, at the expense of its human possessor. But God has set them their bounds which they cannot pass, and when the roaring surge and the waters foaming from the deep trough of the sea reach the shores, they must draw back again. They cannot pass the limits allowed to them, but obey the fixed laws of their being, teaching men the better to observe God's laws by the example of obedience which the very elements provide.

The Creation of Man, Free, yet Under Law

This done, He appointed man, made in the image of God, to rule over the earth, gifted with mind, reason,

[1] Gen. i. 14.

and foresight, that he might be like [1] God. The elements of his body are earthly, but his substance [2] is heavenly, and inspired with the breath of God. God willed that he alone should be free, while He gave him all else for his service. Then, to prevent unfettered freedom from becoming a danger, God laid a command upon him, not to teach him that evil lay in the fruit of a tree, but to warn him that evil would follow (though this was not inevitable), if he disregarded the law laid down, in the exercise of his free will. True, he had to be free, or else man, made in the image of God, would have been an ungodlike slave; but he needed the restraint of law, or freedom would have broken its bounds and degenerated into contempt for its Giver. Man's actions bring their due rewards and penalties; he recognizes as his own all that the impulses of his mind have led him to will in either direction. So we read of mortality coming back upon him, unquestionably through envy;[3] man might have escaped it [4] through obedience, but he obstinately rushes upon it in his headstrong determination to be God. Yet God in His mercy mitigated his punishment; it is not so much he who is, as his labours upon earth that are, cursed. God searches for him *in the garden*,[5] not because He does not know where he is, but to reveal to him the hope of a coming rediscovery [6] and salvation in Christ; he is prevented from touching the fruit of the tree of life, not in malicious envy and spleen, to which

[1] Lit. "Imitator of God." So frequently in this treatise. St. Paul's word in Eph. v. 1 ("followers of God").

[2] See note, chap. vii. p. 40.

[3] Probably, "of the devil," Gen. iii. 5, Wisd. ii. 24. See chap. iv. p. 31.

[4] Some of the heretical sects held that as all matter is evil, man is not responsible for his sins, which are the inevitable consequence of his condition as a material being in a material world.

[5] Words and phrases in italics are added to complete the sense.

[6] Cf. Luke xix. 10.

God could not stoop, but to save him from living for ever, burdened with an immortality of guilt until the day of punishment. Such would have been his lot had not Christ in anticipation pardoned his sins.

The Creation of Spiritual Powers

Not yet have we reached the end. In the higher regions, those above the very firmament, which at present are beyond our sight, He called the angels into being, before the world was, placed spiritual forces in their different spheres, set thrones and principalities[1] to rule them, and established many other measureless tracts of heavens and mysterious[2] operations without limit. Thus it appears that even this boundless universe is the latest of God's material creations rather than His only work. Even the regions beneath the earth are not without their ruling powers, appointed in due order; a place[3] there is to which are guided the souls of righteous and unrighteous, already conscious of the sentence awaiting them at the coming judgment. Thus we see that the vast activities of God, exuberant in every sphere, are not confined within the manifold tracts of the known world, spacious to the utmost as we have described them to be, but may think of them as operating beneath the very

[1] Col. i. 16.

[2] Lit. "Works of sacraments." "Sacramentum" means first "an oath," especially the oath of obedience taken by soldiers, so a solemn ceremony, a mysterious action, an action, word, or object embodying a spiritual truth.

[3] Cf. Luke xvi. 19, where the term "Abraham's bosom" shows that the language generally is symbolical, not literal; the same must be said of Nov.'s "place." We cannot avoid using expressions belonging to ordinary earthly things, in trying to explain things spiritual and invisible. Nov., as a student of Virgil, may have borrowed the expression from that poet's description of Æneas's visit to the underworld, where, however, the condition of the departed souls is widely different. An intermediate state is clearly in his mind; nothing is said of purgation.

deeps and abysses of the world. So does the contemplation of the vastness of His works lead us to the due admiration of the Artificer of such a mighty mass.[1]

CHAPTER II

THE INFINITY OF GOD

God Contains and Unifies all Things

Above all these things is God. As He in Himself contains all things, leaving nothing void of and external to Himself, He has left no place for the "superior God"[2] of some people's imagination. Why, He embraces all things, without exception, in the bosom of His own greatness and power. His care is ever over all His works. He pervades all things, moves all things, gives life to all things, beholds all things; He binds the discordant materials of all the elements into such harmony that they all together make a single universe, knit together in compacted agreement, indestructible by any force, until for our greater blessing He Himself, its Creator, gives the word for its dissolution. For we read that He contains all things, and that nothing, therefore, could have existed exterior to Him. For God has no origin.[3]

[1] A phrase from Nov.'s favourite poet, Virgil—*tantae molis* erat.

[2] Some Gnostic sects (who claimed *Gnosis*, knowledge, beyond that of ordinary men) said that a Spiritual Being could have nothing to do with matter; which, therefore, was formed by a "Demiurge," above whom was the Absolute God. This demiurge was represented as actually being evil, as the maker of gross matter, including the flesh with its desires; hence Nov.'s insistence upon the beneficence and beauty, as well as the grandeur and skill, of creation.

[3] I keep the word "origin" here, as it includes the idea of a personal "source of being"; but not always, when the more familiar word "beginning" seems equally well to express Nov.'s meaning.

The Timelessness of God's Being

Now as He has no origin, it follows that He can experience no end of His Being; unless (far be the thought from us) it could be that He began to exist at a certain time, and is, therefore, not above all things, but began to exist after something else, and is in consequence below that previously existing thing. In that case we should have to admit that He is less powerful than that thing, through our acknowledgment that He is after it in point of time. The necessary inference is, that He is ever boundless,[1] because nothing is greater than He; ever eternal, because nothing is more ancient than He. For that which is without origin can be second to nothing. It has a timeless existence. Thus God is immortal. He cannot attain to an end and pass away. And as that which is without origin is under no law, any limit of time is out of the question. God can have no consciousness of indebtedness to any.

God's Greatness and Attributes beyond our Powers of Thought

Here, and in all our meditations upon the qualities of the attributes and content of God, we pass beyond our powers of fit conception, nor can human eloquence put forth a power commensurate with His greatness. At the contemplation and utterance of His majesty, all eloquence is rightly dumb,[2] all mental effort is feeble. For God is greater than mind itself. His greatness cannot be conceived. Nay, if we could conceive of His

[1] Lat. "immensus," "beyond measure," the word used in the "Athanasian Creed," where it is translated "incomprehensible," *i. e.* "not able to be grasped or confined within limits."

[2] "When we ask, 'What are the Three?' human language labours under great lack of words. Yet the expression 'Three Persons' has been used, not that that might be said, but to avoid keeping silence altogether," says St Augustine (de Trin. v. 9).

greatness, He would be less than the human mind which could form the conception. He is greater than all language, and no statement can express Him. Indeed, if any statement could express Him, He would be less than human speech, which could by such statement comprehend and gather up all that He is. All our thoughts about Him will be less than He, and our loftiest utterances will be trivialities in comparison with Himself. Up to a certain point, of course, we can have experience of Him, without language, but no man can express in words all that He is in Himself. Suppose, for instance, one speaks of Him as light; this is an account of part of His creation, not of Himself. It does not express what He is. Or suppose one speaks of Him as power. This too sets forth in words His attribute of might, rather than His Being. Or suppose one speaks of Him as majesty. Once again, we have a declaration of the honour which is His Own, rather than of Him in Himself. The point needs no further elaboration in detail; to sum up the matter in a single sentence, every possible statement that can be made about God expresses some possession or virtue of God, rather than God Himself. What words or thoughts are worthy of Him, Who is above all language and all thoughts? The conception of God as He is can only be grasped in one way, and even that is impossible for us, beyond our grasp and understanding; by thinking of Him as a Being Whose attributes and greatness are beyond our powers of understanding, or even of thought.

An Illustration from Physical Vision

Our powers of sight are weakened if we gaze upon the sun; the eye cannot inspect his actual orb, because the brilliance of his direct rays are too powerful for them to pierce. So it is with mental vision, in all meditation

upon God. The more it strives to attain to a full conception of Him, the more it is blinded by the light of its own meditations. No language, I repeat, is worthy of God.

He is more sublime than all sublimity, loftier than all loftiness, more profound than all profundity, brighter than all light, more brilliant than all brilliance, more splendid than all splendour, mightier than all might, more powerful than all power, more beautiful than all beauty, more true than all truth, stronger than all strength, greater than all majesty, more potent than all potency, richer than all riches, more foreseeing than all foresight, more merciful than all mercy, more good than all goodness, juster than all justice, more pitiful than all pity. Every kind of virtue and power must of necessity be less than He, Who is the God and Source of them all. It would be true to say that God is "that which is beyond comparison with anything," for He is above everything that can be said of Him. He is a mind, of a sort, which originates all things, and fills all things, and, without beginning or end in time, orders causes in their natural connections with supreme and perfect reason, with a view to the good of the whole.

CHAPTER III

SOME SCRIPTURAL DESCRIPTIONS OF GOD

Him, then, we acknowledge and know as God, Who is the Founder of all things; their Lord, by virtue of His power; their Originator, by virtue of His giving them their being. He "spake and all things were created," He commanded, and "all things" came forth.[1] Of

[1] Ps. cxlviii. 5.

Him it is written, "Thou hast made all things in wisdom."[1] Of Him Moses says, "God is in heaven above and in the earth beneath,"[2] and according to Isaiah, "He has measured the sky with the span, and the earth with his hand; who looketh upon the earth, and maketh it to tremble; who holds fast the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; who weigheth the mountains in scales, and the forests in a balance."[3] The word "balance" expresses the exact precision of the divine arrangement. A vast ill-balanced mass would easily be shattered into fragments, through unstable equilibrium; but God set weight against weight in balanced equipoise, in the massive sphere of earth. It is He Who says, by the prophet, "I am God, and there is none beside me,"[4] and again, "My glory will I not give to another."[5] Thus He shuts the door to all heathen and heretics, with their fancies; He proves that he is not God who is made by the hand of an artificer, nor is he God whom heretical ingenuity has devised. He is not God whose existence requires an artificer.

It is He, again, who says by the prophet, "Heaven is my throne, earth my footstool; what house will ye build for me, or what is the place of my rest?"[6] This is to show us that as the universe cannot contain Him, much less can a temple. It is, of course, a piece of instruction for us, not of boastfulness on the part of God; He is not asking from us glory for His Own greatness, but in fatherly care desires to bestow upon us religious wisdom. Once more, it is He Who in His desire to win to gentleness our souls, so beast-like, so proud and headstrong in their untamed savagery, says,

[1] Ps. civ. 24.
[2] Deut. iv. 39.
[3] Isa. xl. 12, 22; Ps. civ. 32.
[4] Isa. xlv. 18, 22.
[5] Isa. xlii. 8.
[6] Isa. lxvi. 1.

"And upon whom shall my spirit rest, save upon him who is humble and quiet, and trembleth at my words?"[1] So that up to a certain point man can have knowledge of God's greatness, while learning to fear Him through the spirit which He hath given us. Another verse, "I am the Lord, who made light and created darkness,"[2] conveys a lesson of the same kind: that He wishes to come yet more fully within our ken, and arouses in our souls the desire to worship Him. He would not have us think of some vague abstraction called "nature,"[3] as the artificer of the orderly variations of night and day, but rather, and with greater truth, to recognize God as their Founder. Him we learn to know, as we cannot see Him with the physical eye, by the greatness of His works, His power, and His majesty; as the Apostle Paul says, "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead."[4] Thus the human soul, learning to know the hidden things of Him from the things which do appear, uses the eye of the mind to pass from the greatness of His visible works to the greatness of the Artificer.

The same apostle says of Him again, "To the king eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honour and glory"[5] He Who has brought low the greatness of thought has passed beyond the sight of the eyes. For He says, "Of Him and through Him and in Him"[6] are

[1] Isa. lxvi. 2. [2] Isa. xlv. 7.

[3] This was a conception of the Stoic philosophers, the first of whom, Zeno, said that "Nature was the artificer of the universe." Nov. was a Stoic before he became a Christian.

[4] Rom. i. 20. [5] 1 Tim. i. 17.

[6] Rom. xi. 36. The Greek has "unto Him," as the goal to which all creation moves. But the Latin versions often render the preposition "in," not "into" (*e.g.* "Baptize them, in the name of the Father," etc., not, as it should be, "into the name"). In the last sentence of this passage, Nov. shows that he is conscious

all things. All things exist at His command, and are therefore "of Him"; all things are set in order by His word, and are therefore "through Him"; all things are at last submissive to His judgment, and therefore, while they look forward "in Him" to freedom, when the bondage of corruption [1] is laid aside, they know themselves to be recalled "to Him."

CHAPTER IV

GOD IS GOOD, CHANGELESS, SUPREME, ONE, NAMELESS

God is Alone in being Good

"*There is none* good but one, *that is, God*," [2] the Lord declares. It must be so. The whole universe witnesses to His goodness, for had He not been good, He would not have established it. "All was very good," [3] we read; the goodness of creation obviously and naturally proves the goodness of the Creator, and the works of a good Creator can only be good. All evil, then, is a departure from God. It is impossible for Him to be the designer or the artificer of any form of evil, seeing that He claims for Himself the title not only of perfect Artificer, but also of perfect Judge; most of all impossible seeing that He is the Judge and Avenger of every evil work. Evil crosses man's path from no other quarter, unless he had gone back [4] from the good God. This is exactly what we find to have happened; not that

---

of the full meaning of St. Paul's words. He does not, like many early writers, regard the three clauses as referring to the three Persons of the Trinity respectively.

[1] Rom. viii. 21. [2] Luke xviii. 19. [3] Gen. i. 31.

[4] It seems best to keep the irregular construction of the Latin.

it was so of necessity, but that man willed[1] it. Thus it was made clear to us what evil is; and the source of evil was brought to light, lest we should suppose that God was capable of jealousy.[2]

God is Alone in being Changeless

Hence God is always like unto Himself. He does not change, or transform Himself into any shapes. Such change would be a sign of mortality; it would involve alteration, which is a step towards death of some sort. For this reason any addition of parts or of glory is equally impossible to God, for that would imply that at some time He had been short of perfection; nor can there be any question of diminution in Him, for that would attribute to Him an approach to mortality. On the contrary, what He is He always is, and Who He is He always is, and such as He is He always is.[3] Any additions made to a thing show that it had an origin, and any diminution proves its mortality and death. Therefore He saith, "I am the Lord, I change not."[4] He maintains eternally His own state[5] of Being; that which did not come into existence[6] cannot alter. Every possibility that Deity possesses must always be in Him, in order that He may be always God, upholding Himself by His own powers. This explains His words, "I am who am."[7] That

[1] "The seat of sin is, strictly speaking, in the will."
[2] This is what the serpent suggests in Gen. iii. 5.
[3] *i. e.* His Essence, Person, and attributes are unchangeable.
[4] Mal. iii. 6.
[5] Lat. *status*, from the same root as "substance."
[6] Lit. "was not born."
[7] As the Latin substantive verb can be used with or without the personal pronoun, "I am who I am" may be the true rendering of Nov.'s version of the Hebrew, the translation of which is doubtful. The R.V. in Ex. iii. 14 keeps the A.V. rendering, "I am that I am," putting in the margin, "I am because I am," or, "I am who am," or, "I will be that I will be."

which is bears this name, because It always preserves the same attributes.[1] Alteration would at once deprive Him of the name "That which is"; for everything that alters is shown by the very fact of variation to be mortal. It ceases to be what it was, and consequently begins to be what it was not. God therefore, and of necessity, is always like to Himself, and equal to Himself, without the diminution which change would involve. His state of Being abides eternally the same. That which did not come into existence, cannot change, since it is only things that are made, or come into existence, that are liable to alteration; things which at one time did not exist, by coming into being experience existence, and similarly by coming into existence experience change. On the other hand, things which do not come into existence, and have no artificer, are naturally exempt from change, as they have no beginning, and beginning is the cause of alteration.

God is Alone, as being Infinite

So God is declared to be One, as having no equal: since by logical necessity He must be in the highest degree all that Godhead can be, and "in the highest degree" can only mean that He is beyond having an equal. Thus He must be One and alone; with Him nothing can be ranked, since He has no equal. For as the very nature of things declares, there cannot be two infinites. That alone is infinite, which has neither beginning nor end; that which occupies the whole ground,

[1] We use the substantive verb with a predicate, in such sentences as "Cæsar is brave." This "Name" expresses the truth that "God is," *i. e.* "exists of Himself," without a predicate—beyond any epithet or quality. And when we say "Cæsar is brave" we assert that at the moment two things exist together, Cæsar and bravery. Of God it is at all times true that "He is," apart from any dependence upon other things, or upon our powers of recognizing what He is.

blocks out the entry of another into the field. If the infinite does not contain the whole of existence, in every form whatever, it must prove to be within something, by which it is contained, and therefore must be less than this thing which contains it. At once it is brought under the dominion of that other infinite which includes it, for the greater contains the less; it ceases to be God, as that other, which has included it, will have the better claim to be God.

God can have no Proper Name

It results from this, that the proper Name of God is beyond our powers of utterance, or even of conception; since the name of a thing connotes the sum of the conditions of its being as understood.[1] In other words, a name is significant of the reality which could be understood from the name. Here we are dealing with a subject of such a nature that even our intellectual powers cannot bring it under one conception. How shall we fitly express it by a single word of designation, when it so far exceeds those powers as to lie of necessity beyond the significance of any designation? So we may be assured that when God, for certain reasons and upon certain occasions, introduces and mentions His Name, it is not a personal designation, in the legal sense, that has been proclaimed to us, but rather a vaguely significant term appointed for our use, that men may have recourse to it in their need, and find that through it they may appeal to the mercy of God.

[1] The name "John" implies a knowledge of a certain individual, as a man, possessing certain qualities and attributes, distinct from other men. We cannot conceive of the qualities and attributes of God, and as He contains all things, we cannot distinguish Him from anything else, because there is nothing from which to distinguish Him.

God is Alone in being Immortal

Hence God is immortal and incorruptible,[1] experiencing neither diminution nor end in any sense whatever. For because He is incorruptible, He is also immortal, and because immortal, assuredly also incorruptible. The two attributes are linked together by a mutual relationship, and extended by reciprocal bonds into the condition of eternity; immortality following upon incorruptibility, and incorruptibility springing from immortality.

CHAPTER V

GOD IS INCORRUPTIBLE, IN SPITE OF CERTAIN SCRIPTURE EXPRESSIONS

It may be urged that we read of acts of wrath on the part of God and have various accounts of His anger, and know that there are instances recorded of His hatred. But we do not regard these records as portrayals of human vices; all these affections may corrupt human nature, but cannot impair the Might Divine in any way. In men we rightly call them passions; in God we cannot rightly pass judgment upon them.[2] Man can be corrupted by them, because he is capable

[1] A technical term of theology, meaning "not liable to corruption" in the sense explained above, through alteration for better or for worse, from within or from without.

[2] We know nothing higher than man, and therefore in thinking about God we naturally use of Him terms derived from humanity, and all that is best in man we know must be in its perfection in God. It is equally inevitable, that we should attribute what seem to us hurtful things, to sentiments in God similar to those which cause us to harm our fellow-men. But this is due only to the imperfections of human language and human understanding. He has no such sentiments.

of corruption; God cannot, because He is not so capable. Thus they have a power of their own, which they can exercise where they find material[1] capable of passion,[2] not where they find substance incapable of passion. Wrath on the part of God does not spring from vice in Him, but is a remedial method adopted for our benefit. Even in His threatenings He shows His pity; they recall men to the straight path. Fear must have its place, where reason does not avail as an incentive to good living, that those who have rejected the guidance of reason may at least have the incentive of terror. Thus all those expressions of wrath, hatred, and the like, on the part of God, are set before us, as the truth of the matter shows, for the healing of our souls, and spring from deliberate purpose, not from vice; they are not due to weakness. It is impossible for them, therefore, to cause corruption in God. The diversity of the elements of which we are made continually arouses in us the discord of anger; this cannot exist in God, as arising either from His nature, or from vice in Him, since He cannot conceivably be a mass of corporeal elements put together. That which He alone knows Himself to be, whatever be the sum total of His Being, is simple, and free from the admixture of anything bodily. "God is spirit."[3] Thus these affections, which are vicious, and the cause of corruption in men, because they arise from the corruptible nature of his material body, cannot exercise their power of corruptibility in God, since they spring from reason, not from vice.

[1] "Substance" and "material" are contrasted. On "substance" see note, p. 40.

[2] Lat. "passibilis," cf. Article I., "without body, parts, or passions." The word "passio," means not only "suffering," but every kind of emotion, sentiment, feeling, affection.

[3] John iv. 24.

CHAPTER VI

THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC LANGUAGE OF SCRIPTURE

God is not Confined within Corporeal Limits

We admit, again, that the heavenly scripture frequently applies terms which we use of the human body to the Face Divine. For instance, "The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous," [1] or, "The Lord smelled a sweet savour." [2] Tables "written with the finger of God" [3] are given to Moses; the children of Israel are delivered from the land of Egypt "with a mighty hand and stretched out arm." [4] "The mouth of the Lord," we read, "hath spoken it;" [5] the earth is called "the footstool of God;" [6] elsewhere we read, "Incline thine ears and hear." [7]

We say, that "the law is spiritual;" [8] we do not confine a mode of existence, or shape of the Divine Majesty, within the outlines of a bodily frame like our own; on the contrary we extend it infinitely, if I may so say, over the field of its own illimitable greatness. The same scriptures say, "If I climb up into heaven, thou art there; if I go down to hell, thou art there also; if I take my wings and depart across the sea, there shall thy hand hold me, and thy right hand shall keep me." [9]

Scripture uses Language Suited to the Understanding of the People

To ascertain the meaning of holy scripture, we must remember the principle of accommodation.[10] I mean

[1] Ps. xxxv. 15. [2] Gen. viii. 21. [3] Ex. xxxi. 18.
[4] Ps. cxxxvi. 12. [5] Isa. i. 20. [6] Isa. lxvi. 1.
[7] 2 Kings xix. 16. [8] Rom. vii. 14. [9] Ps. cxxxix. 8–10.
[10] Lit. "the moderation of its ordering"—"the meaning may be gathered from the considerate manner in which it is vouchsafed to us" (Fausset). "Ordering" is "dispositio," St. Paul's word

that the prophet spoke of God in the old days in parabolic terms suitable to the period reached in the development of faith,[1] as the people were able to receive their message, not as literally describing God. The necessity for the use of such language in regard to God must be attributed to the people, not to God. On the same principle, the people were allowed to erect the tabernacle, although God cannot be contained within the limits of a tent; they build the temple, although God cannot possibly be pent up within the space of a temple. Thus God is not finite, but the popular imagination is finite; God is not straitened, but the reasoning powers of the popular understanding are straitened. Passing to the gospels, we find the Lord saying, "The hour shall come, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father"; and He gives the reason—"God is spirit, and they who worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth."[2]

The Spiritual Powers of God are expressed by Terms drawn from the Human Body

We see, then, that the various divine powers are expressed in terms drawn from our bodily members; it is not any guise or corporeal outlines of God that is set before us. Eyes are mentioned to express the truth that He sees all men; an ear, to show that He hears all things; a finger, to reveal in a way what we mean by will; nostrils, to make clear that He has the perception of prayer, as we have of odours; hands to prove that He

translated "dispensation," as in Eph. iii. 2, etc. (R. V. margin, "stewardship"; lit. "household management," Greek "economy"). In Chap. III. it is used for the "arrangement" of the universe; Chap. XVIII. the "arrangement" for the salvation of the world.

[1] A truth frequently ignored in the popular literal interpretations of Holy Scripture in these days.

[2] John iv. 21, 24.

is the Author of all creation; an arm, to proclaim that nothing in nature can resist His will; feet, to explain that He fills all things, and that there is nothing wherein God is not. He has no members, or functions of members, necessary to Him, at Whose decision, even unexpressed in words, all things bow down and cry, "Here am I." Why should He, Who is light, require eyes, or He Who is everywhere need feet? How could He desire to walk, when He has nowhere to go outside of Himself? Or look for hands when even His unspoken will is operative for the creation of all things? He needs not ears, Who knows even our unspoken desires. Or why should He require a tongue, Whose thought is a command? These parts were necessary to men, because a man's design would have been inoperative without a body as the organ of his thought; they are needless to God, in Whom operation not only follows upon will without any effort put forth, but even develops simultaneously with will. From another point of view, He is all eye, because He sees in His entirety; or all ear, because He hears; or all hand, because He works; or all foot, because He is everywhere in His entirety. For whatever the entirety of God may be, He contains no differentiation of parts,[1] and is everywhere; since that which is simple does not admit of diversity within itself. Diversity of parts only appears in those organisms which pass from birth to dissolution, while those which are not composite cannot experience it. The mysterious Being which is immortal is one in Itself, simple and eternal. Being one It cannot be dissolved, as It lies outside the law of dissolution, and is not subject to the condition of death.

[1] Lit. "is equal, level." We cannot distribute God's faculties into different parts of His Being, as we can in the case of men.

CHAPTER VII

THE TERM "SPIRIT" AS APPLIED TO GOD

THE Lord speaks of God as spirit, yet I am inclined to think that He uses even this expression in regard to the Father, only to lead on to a yet higher conception of Him than spirit. True, He discusses various points with men in His Gospel, in order to enlarge their understandings; but even so, He, *like the prophets*, speaks to men of God only as they were able to hear and receive it at the time, although, as we said, it is His constant endeavour to enlarge their religious conceptions, even to the knowledge of God. My reason for this view is that we find in scripture that God is called Love, and yet this does not mean that the substance [1] of God is expressed

[1] The word "substantia" (from *sub*, under, and *stare*, to stand) is a purely metaphysical term, meaning "that which persists beneath," "the essential nature of a thing." Several times in this treatise (*e.g.* Chap. V.) it is contrasted with "materia." We are familiar with the use of the term in the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation; which asserts that the "accidents," the outward form of bread and wine, remain the same, while the "substance," the invisible, essential being, is changed. In Chap. XXXI. the meaning of the word draws more near to the Greek word of corresponding etymological derivation: *Hypostasis* (*hypo*, under, root *sta*, to stand), which implies personality rather than essential being. "Substance" might have been used in Latin to express the diversity within the Godhead, as this word *hypostasis* was used in Greek, while *ousia*, "Being," derived from the substantive verb ("I am") was used for the Unity. There is a Latin word, *essentia*, of the same derivation (*esse*, to be), but this was not in common use as *substantia* was, as a metaphysical term, and "three substances" would have meant "three gods." Thus the Greek *Hypostasis*, *Prosopon*, *Ousia* are, in Latin, *Substantia*, *Persona*, *Essentia*.

The Greek formula was "three *hypostases* (or *prosopa*), one *ousia*;" the Latins could not say, "three *substantiæ*," because they had to keep *substantia* as the equivalent of *ousia*. They therefore used *persona*; hence the origin of the phrase, "three Persons," familiar to English ears, but misleading, since "person" has associations of *distinct* personality, which are not present in the original Greek *hypostasis*. On "Persona," see p. 112.

in the term Love. Again, He is called Light, yet the substance of God is not contained in this either. It is simply a mode of saying all that can be said about God. Similarly, it seems true that when He is said to be spirit, this is not an exhaustive definition of His Being; the purpose is, that man's understanding may first attain to the thought of spirit, and then, passing from the intellectual to the spiritual, advance in the spirit to a fuller conception of God. What He is[1] cannot be uttered in human speech, nor perceived by human ears, nor grasped by human senses. If "neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, neither hath the heart of man or his very mind perceived, the things which God has prepared for them that love Him,"[2] what manner of Being must He be, and how great, Who promises these things which it is beyond the natural and mental powers of man to understand? Further, if you take spirit to be the substance of God, you make God out to be a creature, since every spirit is a creature,[3] and so God comes to be not Maker, but made; just as if you follow Moses literally, and take God to be fire, you will commit yourself to the statement that God is a creature, not the Creator. No, these are figurative, not literal expressions. As in the Old Testament God is called fire, to strike fear into the hearts of the sinful people by the revelation of Him as Judge, so in the New Testament He is set forth as spirit, that men may find, in the goodness shown in the mercy bestowed on those who believe, the assurance that He does indeed renew those who were dead in trespasses and sins.

[1] "What He is," refers to the name "I am," in Ex. iii. 14.

[2] 1 Cor. ii. 9.

[3] Certain heretics took this passage as supporting their teaching that God the Holy Spirit is a creature, though it has nothing to do with Him. "Spiritus" means "wind," or "breath," or "spirit." Cf. Jn. iii. 8.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MAJESTY AND PROVIDENCE OF GOD

This, then, is the God Whom the Church knows and reveres, rejecting the fables and fictions of heretics. The whole universe of things, visible and invisible alike, ceaselessly gives witness to Him. Angels adore Him, stars marvel at Him, seas bless Him, lands fear Him, things beneath the earth one and all acknowledge Him. Every human mind is conscious of Him, though it cannot express Him; at His command all things move, springs flow, rivers run their courses, waves arise, all living creatures bear their young, winds are compelled to blow, the rain comes, seas are stirred, all things pour forth the streams of their fruitfulness on every hand.

For the special home of His first created, He appointed a paradise in the East, as a miniature world of eternal life; He planted the "tree of life," and set there another tree corresponding to it, the tree "of the knowledge of good and evil";[1] He gave a command, and issued His sentence condemning transgression. He preserved that most righteous man, Noah, from the perils of the flood because of his innocence and faith; He translated Enoch, admitted Abraham into friendly relationship with Himself, guarded Isaac, and increased Jacob. He appointed Moses to be leader to His people, delivered the groaning children of Israel from the yoke of slavery, wrote them a law, and led the descendants of the patriarchs into the land of promise. He instructed the prophets by His spirit, and through all of them promised His Son, Christ; and sent Him[2] at the time at which He had pledged Himself to give Him.

[1] 1 Gen. ii. 9.

[2] The same term is used in Chap. XXXI. of the eternal generation of the Son.

The Providence of God culminates in Christ

Through Christ[1] He willed that we should come to the knowledge of Himself, and lavished upon us the generous stores of His kindness, pouring upon us in our need and desolation the abundance of His Spirit. His mercy and goodness stretched further yet. He would not have the whole earth dried up, in its aversion to the streams of His grace, but willed that, through His Son, apostolic messengers should be sent into all the world to instruct mankind, that poor humanity might come to know Him Who made it, and if it would but follow Him, find One Whom they might address in their prayers as Father, instead of as God.

The Providence of God over Individuals and Communities

God's Providence ran, or rather runs, to and fro, not over single individuals only, but over whole cities and states, of whose overthrow He sang by the mouths of the prophets, and indeed over the whole world. World-wide results of unbelief are described—various forms of overthrow, plague, loss, and punishment. This might have suggested that God's never-failing Providence does not extend to the most minute details. But "One out of two sparrows shall not fall to the ground without your Father," saith the Lord; "even the hairs of your head are all numbered."[2] His care and Providence did not allow "the garments" of the Israelites to perish, nor the "commonest shoes of their feet to be worn out";[3] nor even the hosen[4] which the three children wore as captives to be burnt in the furnace. It could

[1] Some heretics said that the God revealed by Christ was not the God of the Old Testament (cf. p. 25).

[2] Matt. x. 29, 30. [3] Deut. viii. 4.

[4] "Sarabara"; the loose trouser of the Persians, which it was the pride of the Greeks to have been the first to face without flinching (cf. Dan. iii. 27).

not be otherwise; for He Who "contains all things"[1] embraces all things, and the sum of all things is made up of individual things. As His Providence, then, extends to the whole sum of things, without exception, His care will be in touch with every individual thing.

The World as the Chariot of God

This is why He is said to "sit above the cherubim;"[2] that is, He rules over all His various works. Those living things which hold dominion over the rest are in subjection to His throne, and "the crystal over their heads above"[3] covers all things. In other words, all things are hidden by the sky, which at God's command was made into a solid firmament[4] from the fluid material of the waters, that the tough ice, hardened by frost, might form a division between the waters which at one time covered the earth, and bear upon its back, so to speak, the weight of the water which is above the earth. Under it, wheels are set;[5] meaning times and seasons, rolling on like wheels for ever, or feet upon which ride all members of the earth, never standing still, but ever passing on. All their limbs are full of eyes like stars, because we have to consider the works of God with watchful observation. And within their bosom is a fire of glowing coals. This may mean that the world with which we are now concerned is hastening to the fiery day of judgment, or that all the works of God are fiery—not dark, but full of vigour; or again, that it is God's purpose that these members, sprung from earthly beginnings, should not settle down in the inactivity natural to the cold elements of which they were

[1] Wis. i. 7. [2] Ps. lxxx. 1. [3] Ezek. i. 22.

[4] The Hebrew word in Gen. i. is truly rendered by our "firmament," "vault of heaven." Nov.'s view of Holy Scripture in chap. vi. applies here; the Bible was not given to us to teach natural science.

[5] Ezek. i. is in the author's mind through this passage.

made. Hence all were endowed with a new nature, a spirit burning within them, to mingle with their chill bodies, and so give to all of them, in proportion to their needs, energies for the exercise of life. This, then, according to David, is the chariot of God. "The chariot of God," he says, "is multiplied ten times a thousand times";[1] that is, it is innumerable, infinite, immeasurable.[2] Under the yoke of natural law,[3] given to all, some things are drawn back, as if pulled in with a bridle; some are urged forward, as if sped by slackened reins. The angels, too, have their part in guiding the chariot of God, the world and all that is therein, and the stars. Varied indeed are the courses of these, and we see the angels guiding them to the goal of the time appointed for them. Well may it rejoice us to cry with the apostle, as we marvel at the Artificer and at His works, "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"[4]—and the rest of the passage.

PART II.—OF GOD THE SON

CHAPTER IX

THE SON PROMISED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND REVEALED IN THE NEW

The Promise in the Old Testament

THE same rule of truth teaches us to believe, secondly, in the Son of God, Jesus Christ, our Lord God, yet

[1] Ps. lxviii. 17.
[2] "Immensus"; the word used of God in Chap. II. ("boundless").
[3] Probably a Stoic expression.
[4] Rom. xi. 33.

God as the Son of God,[1] the Son of this God of Whom we have been speaking, the one and only God, that is to say, the Creator of all things, as has been shown above. This Jesus Christ, the Son, I repeat, of this God, was promised, we read, in the Old Testament; and we find Him set before us in the New Testament, fulfilling the shadows and types of all mysterious[2] foreshowings, by the presentation of the embodied truth. To Him, the Son of Abraham and the Son of David, the ancient prophecies and the gospels alike bear witness.

Let us examine this witness[3] to Him. We find it even in Genesis, in the words, "To Thee will I give it, and to thy seed";[4] in the man whom we are shown to have wrestled with Jacob; and again, "A prince shall not fail from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until he shall come to whom it hath been promised,[5] and he shall be the desire of the nations." In other books of Moses, "Look out another, whom thou mayest send";[6] "God shall raise up a prophet unto you from among your brethren";[7] "Ye shall see

[1] Nov. deals with the difference between "God" and the "Son of God," especially in his last two chapters. The Son is "God" as deriving His Godhead from the Father, the Source of all Being. It is "through" the Son, not "by" the Son, that all things were made, the Son carrying out the Father's will; but through the "community of substance" He is God.

[2] Lat. "sacrament." The God of the Old Testament is again shown to be not other than the God of the New Testament.

[3] Nov. traces the development of the "Messianic hope." As it continued the same throughout the centuries covered by the "divine library of the Old Testament," it is truly a marvellous witness to Christ.

[4] Gen. xvii. 8.

[5] The Hebrew word in Gen. xlix. 10 is of uncertain meaning. A.V. and R.V. have, "Till Shiloh comes"; the Septuagint reads, "Until that which is his shall come." Others render, "Till he comes whose it is," or "Till he comes, who shall be sent."

[6] Ex. iv. 13.

[7] Deut. xviii. 15.

see your life hanging by night and by day, and shall not believe him."[1]

Passing to Isaiah, we find, "The rod of Jesse shall put forth shoots, and a flower shall spring from his root";[2] "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son."[3] He foretells His works of healing: "Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf hear; then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing."[4] He shows His miracles of endurance: "His voice shall not be heard in the streets; a bruised rod shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench."[5] He described His gospels: "I will make with you an everlasting covenant, even the unfailing holy things of David."[6] He prophesies that the Gentiles shall believe on Him: "Behold, I have made him a ruler and commander to the peoples. The peoples which have not known thee shall call upon thee, and the nations which know thee not shall flee unto thee."[7] He bears witness to Christ when he cries (referring to His passion): "He was brought as a sheep to the slaughter, and as a lamb before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth."[8] Then he described the blows of the scourges, and the stripes--"by his stripes we are healed"—and His humility: "And we beheld him, and he had no beauty, or honour. A man bruised, and knowing the bearing of weakness." He bore witness to the future unbelief in Him on the part of the people: "All the day long have I stretched forth my hands unto an unbelieving people."[9]

The witness continues, that He shall rise again from

[1] Deut. xxviii. 66.
[2] Isa. xi. 1.
[3] Isa. vii. 14.
[4] Isa. xxxv. 5, 6.
[5] Isa. xlii. 2, 3.
[6] Isa. lv. 3.
[7] Isa. lv. 4, 5.
[8] Isa. liii. 5 ff.
[9] Isa. lxv. 2.

the dead: "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, and one who shall arise to rule the Gentiles, in him shall the Gentiles trust, and his rest shall be glorious";[1] the time of His resurrection being shown by, "As at daybreak shall we find him ready."[2] He is to sit at the right hand of the Father: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool";[3] and is represented as the possessor of all things: "Desire of me, and I will give thee the peoples for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession."[4] Lastly, He is shown to be the Judge of all: "Give the king thy judgment, and thy righteousness unto the king's son."[5]

I need not pursue the matter further at this point; these Scriptural foreshowings of Christ are well known to every heretic, and still better known to those who hold the truth.

CHAPTER X

THE DOCETIC[6] CHRIST

Such an Imaginary Being is no Help to Us

I MUST, however, beg my readers to observe, that no other Christ was to be looked for in the Gospel, than this Christ Who was promised by the Creator in the writings of the Old Testament, especially as the predictions about Him have been fulfilled, and all that has been fulfilled was predicted. With justice I may say,

[1] Isa. xi. 10. [2] Hos. vi. 3. [3] Ps. cx. 1, 3.
[4] Ps. ii. 8. [5] Ps. lxxii. 1.
[6] The "Docetæ" (Greek *dokeo*, "I seem") held that Christ did not have a real body, as God could not come into such close contact with matter, but only the appearance of a body.

as truth and loyalty demand, to that elusive personality, the specious and highly coloured creation from old wives' fables, the imaginary Christ of the heretics who reject the authority of the Old Testament: "Who are you? Whence are you? By whom were you sent? Why did you choose to come at this particular time?[1] Why are you what you are? By what way did you manage to come? Why did you not go off to your own people, but come among strangers? Unless it was that you have proved that you have no people of your own. What have you to do with the Creator's world, or with man, the work of the Maker, or with a make-believe body, which you rob of the hope of resurrection? Why do you come to another man's servant, and desire to disquiet another man's son? Why do you try to tear me from the Lord? Why do you urge me to blaspheme against the Father, and to plunge into impiety? What have I to look for from you in the way of resurrection, seeing that I lose my body, and do not recover myself?[2] If you wish to save, you ought to have made man, to whom to give salvation. If you wish to deliver me from sin, you ought to have provided me in advance with immunity[3] against sin. What credentials from the law do you carry about with you? What witness to your claims have you in the language of the prophets? What tangible promise can I give myself about you, when I see that you have come as a ghost, not with a tangible body? And if you hate the body, what have you to do with an outward form? Your desire to take upon you the outward form of a body proves that after all you carry about with you the substance of a body;

[1] *i.e.* suddenly, at the Baptism of Jesus (p. 14).

[2] Such a bodiless ghost holds out no hope of "the resurrection of the body," and the persistence of personality.

[3] So Fausset. I should prefer, "a defence against sin." Christ did not provide us with immunity from sin.

for if you hated the reality, you ought to have hated the semblance of a body.[1] If you are a second Christ, you ought to have come in a different way, to save yourself from being called the Son of the Creator, from your possession of even the appearance of flesh and blood. At least, if birth was hateful to you, who hated the Creator's ordinance of union in marriage, you ought to have refused even to resemble a man, who is born according to that ordinance."

Various Forms of the Heresy

So we do not recognize the Christs offered us by heretics. One existed in appearance (to use their term), and not in reality. Then none of His acts were real, if He was a ghost, and not a reality. Another received nothing from Mary, and in no way took upon him a human body. Surely, he never came to us at all, this person who appeared, and yet was not visible in our substance. A third, as other heretics have wished to have it, clothed himself with ethereal or sidereal flesh.[2] We should see no salvation in our own Christ, if we did not recognize also in Him the tangible substance of our own body.

The Truth of the Incarnation, and its Value to us

In fact, we reject every other Christ devised by heretics with a fictional body of any kind whatever. The birth of the Lord, equally with His death, puts them all out of the question. "The Word," says John, "became

[1] The heretics showed by attributing to Christ an imaginary body, that a body was really necessary for one who could save men.

[2] A Gnostic teacher of the second century, named Apelles, taught that Christ descended from heaven in a mysterious manner, and contracted a body made up from the four elements of earth, air, fire, and water, which were dispersed abroad before the soul of Jesus ascended into heaven.

flesh and dwelt among us";[1] as the Word[2] took our flesh, Christ must have had a human body. And the blood flowed from His hands and feet, and even from His side, in proof that He, dying under the laws which govern human dissolution, shared our human body, and the wounds in that same body proved that He was raised in the substance of the very body in which He died. This restoration, in His resurrection, of the very body which He derived from us men, shows us the conditions of our resurrection. In Christ's rising from the dead in the substance of His body, as the norm of all, the law of resurrection is laid down. True, it is written that "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God";[3] but it is not that the substance of our flesh is condemned.[4] This was fashioned by the hands of God, so as not to perish. It is only the guilt of the flesh that is censured, and rightly so, for man's

[1] John i. 14.

[2] Nov. here uses the Latin word *sermo* instead of *verbum*. In the earliest times, both were used to translate St. John's Greek word *Logos*, familiar to us in such words as "theology," "geology"; but *sermo* soon fell out of use, as it means only the spoken word, while *Logos* means not only the spoken word, but the reason or thought which occasions the spoken word. Thus the universe expresses the "reason" of God, as a spoken word expresses the thought of a man; and as God could never be "without reason," the Word was in the beginning with God. This "reason" is not only an attribute of God, but a Person, as inseparable from Him as reason is from a man; thus the Word made flesh entered upon the condition of expressing under a material form, with the rest of the material universe, the reason or thought of God. The title "Son" might imply that "there was a time when the Son was not"; such an error is ruled out by the use of the title "Word" or "Reason."

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 50.

[4] As said above, some Gnostics said that the flesh is so vile that it was impossible for God to be brought into contact with it. Hence some urged that it must be treated with severity and cruelty, so as to keep the spirit free; while others, on the ground that the spirit could not be affected by a thing so much beneath it, showed their contempt for it by all manner of license and excess. The resurrection of such an evil thing as the body was, of course, denied. Note, "substance," not "material"; cf. p. 36.

rash and wilful rebellion against the requirements of the Divine law. But when this guilt has been taken away in Baptism, and in the dissolution brought about by death, then the deathfulness of sin is put away, and the flesh is recalled to a state of innocence, and so restored to salvation.

CHAPTER XI

CHRIST: THE SON OF GOD, AND THE SON OF MAN

Christ is not Man only

YET observe: when we declare that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God the Creator, was manifested in the substance of a true body, we must not seem to have capitulated, or to have provided the foundation of an argument, to other heretics, who in this connection maintain that He was solely and simply man, and accordingly are anxious to prove that He was a bare man, and nothing more. We use such language as to the substance of His body, as not to assert that He is simply and solely man, but to maintain that, according to the Scriptures, He was also God, through the entry of the Divinity of the Word into the union[1] of the two natures. For it is gravely perilous, to say of Him Who is the Saviour of the human race, the Lord and Ruler of the whole world, to Whom all things have been

[1] *Concretio* (akin to our word "concrete"), "growing together." On p. 62 the word is *connexio*, "binding together"; p. 64, *conjunctio*; p. 107, *permixtio*, "complete mingling"; p. 139, *communio*. "Nature" is, after all, an abstract term, and two "natures" cannot be joined, bound, mixed together like material fluids or threads, yet we feel instinctively that there is a difference between Divine and human nature, and have to use terms derived from material things to express the truth that Christ is God as well as man, though where the line is to be drawn between them we cannot say.

entrusted and granted by His Father, through[1] Whom all things were made, all things created, all things set in order, the King of all ages and times, the Ruler of all angels, before Whom nothing existed save the Father,[2] that He is man only, and to deny His Divine authority in these different spheres. This disrespect on the part of heretics will attach equally to God the Father; it means that the Father could not beget a Son.

The Godhead and the Manhood stand or fall together

No amount of blindness on the part of heretics shall lay down the law for the truth; and if they hold with something and not with something else, or see one part and do not see another, in Christ's *Personality*, we will not surrender the part which they do not see for the sake of the part which they do see. They dwell upon the frailties of a man in Him, but do not take account of the powers of a God; they bear in mind the weaknesses of His flesh, but the mighty acts of Divinity they shut out of consideration. Yet if the proof drawn from the weaknesses of Christ is sufficient to demonstrate from those weaknesses that He is man, the proof of Divinity in Him drawn from His powers will be sufficient to establish from His mighty works that He is also God. If His sufferings show the human frailty, why may not His mighty works show the Divine power that was in Him? If not—if His wonderful works are not sufficient proof that He is God—His sufferings do not suffice to show that He is man. Whatever principle is established in either of the two theses, will be found to

[1] "Through" rather than "by," the word used in our translation of the Nicene Creed. All things were made by God the Father, but "through" His Word or Reason. "He spake, and it was done"; not that He used speech, but that that which was made expressed His thought or reason, as speech does with us.

[2] See Chap. XXXI.

apply equally to the other; it is unsafe to maintain that His mighty powers do not prove the Godhead, for then His sufferings do not prove His manhood. We cannot lean to one set of facts, and shirk the other; the man who shuts out from consideration any part of the truth will not hold the truth in perfection. Holy Scripture as plainly proclaims that Christ is God, as it proclaims God as very man; it describes Jesus Christ as man, as clearly as it describes the Lord Christ as God. It sets Him before us as not only the Son of God, but also the Son of man. It not only calls Him the Son of man, but again and again speaks of Him as the Son of God; showing that as He is of both,[1] He is both. Otherwise, if He is only the one, He cannot be the other. The very nature of things compels us to believe Him to be man, Who is of man, and compels us equally to believe Him to be God, Who is of God; otherwise, if He is not God, when He is of God, He is not man, though He be of man. Thus each of the two statements stands or falls by the other; rejection of the one discredits the other.

Scriptural Support of the Union of Natures[2]

We appeal, then, to those who find in Scripture that the man Christ Jesus is the Son of man, to find also

[1] Lat. *ex*, "out of" or "from." See John viii. 42. In the Nicene Creed "God of God" means that Christ is God, but not as "the fountain of Godhead," the Father.

[2] It is easy to say that Christ is both God and man. But here, as in all other things, the question arises, Where does the work of the Divine Nature end, and the work of the human nature begin? It is only another form of the question, Where does the work of the farmer end, and the work of God begin, in supplying us with "our daily bread"? Where does the freedom of man's will and his free choice of action, conditioned as it is by circumstances, environment, and the general will of the community, end, and the controlling and guarding will of God begin? We can only say, here is One Whose actions, life, and words are more than human;

that He is entitled God, the Son of God. For in whatever sense, as man, He is "of Abraham," He is also, as God, "before Abraham"[1] himself; in whatever sense, as man, He is "the Son of David," He is also, as God, entitled "the Lord" of David.[2] In whatever sense, as man, "He is made under the law,"[3] He is also, as God, declared to be "the Lord of the Sabbath";[4] in whatever sense, as man, He endured the sentence of death, He is found as God to "exercise" full judgment over quick and dead. In whatever sense, as man, He is born after the creation of the world, He is declared to have existed, as God, before the world was; in whatever sense, as man, He was born "of the seed of David," it is said that "through Him," as God, "the world" was made. In whatever sense, as man, He was after many brethren, He was, as God, before all men; in whatever sense, as man, He was the servant of the rest, as God He was greater than all. In whatever sense, as man, He ascended into heaven, as God, He first descended from heaven; in whatever sense, as man, "He goeth to the Father,"[5] as a Son obedient to His Father is He to descend from the Father.

The Faith must be Complete

Thus, if His limitations attest His human frailty, the tokens of His majesty declare His Divine power; it is unsafe to read of two principles, and yet to accept one, but not both. As we read of both principles in the Person of Christ we accept both, if we would have our

but if we attempt to define the limits of either nature, we are dealing with a mystery which is beyond our grasp. Scientists tell us that there are no straight lines in nature; species glides into species, genus into genus, inanimate into animate, material into immaterial, by hardly perceptible gradations. So it is with the Divine and human natures in Him Who is both Son of God and Son of man.

[1] John viii. 58. [2] Matt. xxii. 45. [3] Gal. iv. 4.
[4] Luke vi. 5. [5] John xiv. 28.

faith to be complete, and because complete, true. For if one of the two principles drops out of sight in one's belief, while the other, and that the less important, is accepted as a matter of faith, the rule of truth is thrown into confusion, and such presumption will be found not to have brought salvation, but to have entailed instead a serious peril of death, through the wilful rejection of the faith.

CHAPTER XII

OLD TESTAMENT PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

The Language of Hosea

WHY, then, should we hesitate to affirm what the language of Scripture does not hesitate to express? Why is the rule of faith to falter where the authority of Scripture has never faltered? Here is the prophet Hosea[1] saying in the Name[2] of the Father, "I will not save them by bow, nor by horses, nor by horsemen; but I will save them by the Lord their God." If God declares that He saves them by God, and God does not save except by Christ, why should man hesitate to call Christ God, when he observes that it is laid down by the Father, through the Scriptures, that He is God? Indeed, if God the Father does not save, except by God, none can be saved by God the Father, unless he has confessed that Christ is God, in Whom and through Whom the

[1] Hosea is speaking (i. 7) of deliverance from Assyria; the promise was fulfilled in the destruction of Sennacherib's host. But this deliverance was a type of all God's deliverances; He saves in His own way, whether from earthly enemies, or from sin and death. Here His way was to send His Son.

[2] Lit. "from the Person of the Father." "Persona" is properly "a character in a play." Thus the prophet speaks as "playing the part of" the Father, representing Him before men. So on pp. 84, 112.

Father promises to grant salvation. Obviously, therefore, every one who acknowledges Him to be God finds salvation in Christ Who is God, and every one who does not recognize Him as God will find that he has lost that salvation, since he cannot find it except in Christ Who is God.

The Language of Isaiah

For while Isaiah says, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and ye shall call his name Emmanuel,"[1] which is interpreted "God is[2] with us," in the same sense Christ Himself says, "Lo, I am with you, even unto the end of the world."[3] God, then, is with us; nay, much more is He even in us. Christ is with us; He it is, then, Whose name is "God is with us," because He is actually with us. Surely no one will deny that He is with us? If He is not with us, how does He declare that He is with us? Clearly, He is with us, and as He is with us, He is called Emmanuel, that is "God is with us." As then it is God Who is with us, He is called "God is with us."

[1] Isaiah's words (vii. 14) at first appear to mean, that before a girl who is at the time of speaking unmarried, shall bear a child, the deliverance shall have come; and that in their joy his parents shall give him the name, "God is with us," just as a French child, in joy and confidence, might be called Victoire. But the contents of Isaiah's chaps. vii. to xii. show that a great deal more than this is meant. The deliverance is, in some way, to be brought about through a particular child who is in the prophet's mind; and the description given of him could suit no ordinary human child. As a man crossing a mountain range sees a low elevation before him, and when he has scaled this, finds a yet higher ridge to be crossed, and so, again and again, until he reaches the highest pass; so, as we study the prophets, we find a higher and yet a higher meaning, until all is made clear in Christ.

[2] This is clearly the meaning of the name (see R.V., margin). In chap. viii. 10, "For God is with us," is in the Hebrew, "For Emmanuel," as if two words, "Emmanu," with us, and "El," God, forming a statement of fact, the word "is" being understood

[3] Matt. xxviii. 20.

Take another passage from Isaiah. "Be strong, ye weak hands and feeble knees; be comforted, ye of weak heart, be strong, fear not: behold, our God will award judgement: He will come and save us; then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall hear; then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall speak freely."[1] These are the signs which the prophet declares shall follow at the coming of God: and they have been wrought.

The Dilemma confronting Heretics

Our opponents, then, must either acknowledge Christ to be the Son of God, at Whose coming, and by Whose hands, these signs of healing were wrought, or they must yield to the truth of the Divinity of Christ, and plunge into heresy on the other side. As they will not confess that Christ is the Son of God, and God, they must confess that He is the Father.[2] The language of the prophets is decisive; with it before them, they cannot deny that Christ is God. What can they answer when the prophets declare that at the coming of God shall follow these signs, which were wrought at the coming of Christ? In what sense do they accept Christ as God? With the facts before them, they cannot deny that He is God. Do they accept Him as the Father or as the Son? If it is as the Son, why do they deny that the Son of God is God? If it is as the Father, why are they not followers of those who definitely hold this form of blasphemy? Anyhow, in our contention with them as to the truth, it is enough for our present purpose that, however they arrive at the conviction,[3] they should

[1] Isa. xxxv. 3-6.

[2] This heresy is discussed in Chaps. XXIII., XXIV., XXVI.

[3] So long as they admit Christ to be God, the question whether He is God the Father or God the Son can be waived. It is dealt with in Chap. XXVI.

confess that Christ, Whose Godhead they wished to deny, is both God and man.

The Language of Habakkuk

By the mouth of the prophet Habakkuk God says, "God shall come from Africa,[1] and the Holy One from the dark and thick mountain."[2] Whom would our opponents have to come from Africa? If they say that God the Father Almighty came, God the Father came from a certain place; from which it follows that He is enclosed in a place, and contained within the limits of some habitation or other.

In that case, as we said, the impious heresy of Sabellius is embodied in them (if they really believe that Christ is not the Son, but the Father), and strangely enough, while they insist upon the assertion that Christ was a bare man, they turn round and prove that He was the Father, God Almighty. But as Christ, Who is described in Scripture as God, as well as man, was born at Bethlehem, which geographically faces towards the south, the text rightly speaks of this God as coming from Africa, for the prophet foresaw that He would come from Bethlehem. There are two alternatives before them, as to this Person, Who comes[3] from Africa: He is either the Son or the Father, for it is God Who is said to be coming from Africa. If it is the Son, why do they hesitate to call Christ God as well as man? I repeat, Scripture says it is God Who shall come.

If it is the Father, why do they hesitate to cast in

[1] Heb. Teman, the name given to the southern district of Edom, though it means "the south" generally. So Nov. uses the name given to a southern country for "the south."

[2] Hab. iii. 3.

[3] Nov. does not consider that the coming of God the Son, as man, from a particular place, implies that the Son of God is so confined or limited.

their lot with the presumption of Sabellius, who says that Christ is the Father? The truth is, that whether they call Him the Father or the Son, they are forced, though against their will, to abandon their heretical assertion that Christ is only man; the logic of facts compels them at last to affirm His Godhead, whether they choose to call Him the Father or the Son.

CHAPTER XIII

NEW TESTAMENT PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

The Word made Flesh

So *in the New Testament* John, in his account of the birth of Christ, says, "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."[1] The reason for his statement is, that "His name is called the Word of God";[2] and rightly so called, for "My heart," God says, "hath uttered a good word"[3]—the good word which directly afterwards He calls by the name of king, when He says, "I speak of what I have made unto the king." He is King, because "all things were made through him, and without him

[1] John i. 14. [2] Rev. xix. 13.

[3] Ps. xlv. is an ode written in celebration of the marriage of a King; anointed (v. 7), and addressed as "O God" (v. 6); "the Lord" of the Bride "all glorious within." As the language is too highly exalted for any human nuptials, it was always regarded by the Jews as a Messianic Psalm. "Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is greater than that of the sons of men" (Chaldee paraphrase). Tertullian, Cyril, Ambrose, and Athanasius give the same mystical interpretation to the first verse as Nov. here. "So the Father tells all the secrets of His Own eternity to that King appointed by Him upon the holy hill of Sion" (Neale).

was not anything made."[1] "For whether they be thrones," says the apostle, "or dominions, or powers, or principalities, all things, visible and invisible, through him consist."[2] This Word is the Word which "came unto his own, and his own received him not." For "the world was made through him, and the world knew him not:"[3] and this "Word was in the beginning with God, and the Word was God."[4] When we consider the final statement, that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," who can hesitate for an instant to express his conviction that Christ, Whose birth is the subject of the passage, is man, seeing that He was made flesh, and God, seeing that He is the Word of God? Especially when he notices that the Gospel Scripture has associated both natures[5] in the single harmony of Christ's birth.

The Bridal Union of Christ with the Flesh

He[6] it is Who "cometh forth out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a giant to run his course; his coming forth is from the highest heaven, and his return even to the highest again." His return is to the highest; and "no man hath ascended up into heaven, but he who came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is in heaven."[7] This is the thought which He takes up in His prayer, "Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."[8] If this Word is descended from heaven, to take our flesh, as a bridegroom takes his bride, in order that by taking

[1] John i. 3. [2] Col. i. 16.
[3] John i. 10, 11. [4] John i. 1, 2.
[5] Lat. "both substances," in the usual sense of "essences." So p. 109.
[6] Ps. xix. speaks of the sun; but "God is light" in the spiritual, as the sun in the physical world.
[7] John iii. 13. [8] John xvii. 5.

flesh He might ascend again as Son of man to that heaven from which as Son of God He had descended, and by a mutual conjunction[1] flesh wears the word of God, and the Son of God assumes the weakness of flesh, He naturally ascended again with His bride the flesh to that place from which without flesh He had descended, and so resumes the glory which He is declared to have had before the creation of the world. Thus His Godhead is most demonstrably proved. And it is equally clear, when the world itself is stated to have been founded after Him, that it was created through Him; this itself is a proof of the glory and authority of Godhead residing in Him through Whom the world was made.

The Language of Christ and His Apostles

I submit[2] the following considerations. It is God, and God only, to Whom it belongs to know the secrets of the heart; Christ sees the secrets of the heart. It is God, and God only, to Whom it belongs to forgive sins; Christ, again, forgives sins. To no man does it belong to come down from heaven; Christ came down from heaven, in coming into the world. To no man does it belong to declare, "I and the Father are one";[3] Christ alone, in the consciousness of His Divinity, utters this declaration. The Apostle Thomas, convinced at last by all the proofs of His Godhead, and by the facts, makes the response to Christ, "My Lord and my God."[4] The Apostle Paul writes in his epistle, "Of whom are the fathers, and of whom Christ came according to the flesh,

[1] Lat. *connexio*, "binding together."

[2] In the Latin, each of these eight arguments begins with "But if," a favourite rhetorical device of Novatian, varied by "What if . . . ?" The expression of our lawyers, "I submit that," seems to carry the same meaning in a more English way.

[3] John x. 30. [4] John xx. 28.

who is God over all, blessed for evermore;"[1] and again, that he is "an apostle, appointed not of men, or through man, but through Jesus Christ;" and asserts that he "has learnt his gospel, not of men, or through man, but through Jesus Christ."[2] From all this the deduction follows: Christ is God.

All Things are through Him

So this is how the matter stands: we must accept one or the other of two alternatives. As it is clear that all things were made through Christ, either He is before all things (for "all things are through him"[3]), and, if so, it follows that He is God as well as man; or else, as He is man, He is after all things, and it follows that nothing was made through Him. But it is impossible for us to assert that nothing was made by Him, when we note that it is written, "All things were made through him." He is not, then, after all things; that is, He is not only man—who is after all things—but also God; for it is God Who is before all things. He is before all things because "through him are all things." Otherwise, if He is man only, nothing is through Him; on the other hand, if all things are through Him, He is not only man. For if He is only man, all things are not through Him; indeed, nothing is through Him. What do our heretics urge in reply? That nothing is through Him, so that He is only man? How, then, are all things through Him? No, He is not only man, but also God,

[1] Some allege that these words are merely an ascription of praise to God inserted, after the Jewish fashion, at the end of the sentence. But in such ascriptions the order is always "blessed be God" (*e.g.* Eph. i. 3), not "God (is) blessed"—which is the order in the quotation (Rom. ix. 5; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 31); if this was all, "as concerning the flesh" would have no meaning; and "who is over all" showing the extraordinary privileges of the Jews, can only refer to "Christ" as antecedent.

[2] Gal. i. 1, 12.

[3] Col. i. 16.

since all things are through Him. We are bound to understand that Christ is not only man, who is after all things, but that He is also God, since all things were made through Him. How can one assert that He is only man, *or that He is only God*,[1] when He is seen also in flesh? If both sets of facts are duly noted, belief in both natures must logically follow.

CHAPTER XIV

FURTHER SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

YET the heretic still hesitates to say that Christ is God, though he sees that He is proved to be God by so many facts, and so many utterances of Holy Scripture. If Christ is only man, how did He "come unto His own"[2] when He came into this world, seeing that there is no world made by a man? If Christ is only man, how is the world said to have been "made through Him," when it is stated, not that the world was formed through a man, but that man was formed after the world? If Christ is only man, how can it be that Christ is not of human seed only, but that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us"?[3] True, the first man was not of human seed; but he was not compounded from the union of the Word and flesh. In Adam, the word was not made flesh, and did not dwell among us.

If Christ is only man, how does "he who came down from heaven, testify what he hath seen and heard,"[4] when it stands to reason that, as a man cannot be born

[1] Some words have been lost from the original manuscript, which scholars supply by the words in italics.

[2] John i. 11. [3] John i. 14. [4] John iii. 31, 32.

in heaven, he cannot come from heaven? If Christ is only man, how are "things visible and invisible, thrones principalities, and powers" said to have been "created through him, and in him,"[1] when the heavenly powers cannot have been created through man, as they must have existed actually before man? If Christ is only man, how is He present everywhere when we call upon Him? Since it is God's nature, not man's, to be able to be present everywhere. If Christ is only man, why do we call upon Him in our prayers as our Mediator,[2] when we know that it is useless to call upon a man to grant salvation? If Christ is only man, why do we rest our hopes in Him, when "hope in a man"[3] is declared to be "accursed"? If Christ is only man, why may He not be denied without destruction of the soul, when it is declared that an offence against a man can be forgiven? If Christ is only man, how does John Baptist bear witness of Him, saying, "He who cometh after me was made before me, for he was before me,"?[4] If He is only man, born after John, He cannot be before John. The words can only mean, that, as God, He existed before John's birth.

If Christ is only man, how is it that "whatsoever things the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise,"[5] when a man cannot do works like the heavenly works of God? If Christ is only man, how is it that "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself,"[6] when a man cannot

[1] Col. i. 16.

[2] One of the earliest testimonies to Christianity, Pliny's letter to Trajan, tells us, that the Christians sang hymns of praise to Christ as God. But the instinct of the early Church generally was, to address prayers to the Father through Christ, not directly to Christ.

[3] Jer. xvii. 5. [4] John i. 15. [5] John v. 19.

[6] This verse (John v. 26) explains the expression in chap. xxxi. "germane" to the Father. The Son has life in Himself, as the Father has, and is co-eternal with Him; but by gift from Him.

have life in himself in the manner of God the Father, seeing that he does not exist in an eternity of glory, but is made of the material of mortality? If Christ is only man, how does He say, "I am the bread of eternal life, who came down from heaven,"[1] when neither can mortal man be himself the bread of life, nor has mortal man descended from heaven, since in heaven no place has been appointed for the material of frailty? If Christ is only man, how does He declare, "For no man hath seen the Father at any time, save he which is of the Father, he hath seen him,"[2] seeing that if Christ is only man, He could not have seen God, for no man has seen God; but if, being of God, He saw God, He wished Himself to be understood to be more than man, as having seen God. If Christ is only man, why does He say, "What if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?"[3] But He did ascend into heaven; He was therefore before in heaven, as heaven is the place to which He returns where He was before. But if He was sent down by the Father from heaven, He assuredly is not only man; for, as we said, a man could not come down from heaven. He was not then "before" in heaven as man, but He ascended to that place where as man He had not been; while He descended as the Word of God, which was in heaven—that Word, I repeat, of God, who is also God, "through whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made." So it was not as man that He came down from heaven, but as the Word of God, that is, as God.

[1] John vi. 51. [2] John vi. 46. [3] John vi. 62.

CHAPTER XV

FURTHER SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF CHRIST'S DIVINITY, CONSIDERED AT GREATER LENGTH

Christ knows whence He is—from Heaven

If Christ is only man, how is it that He says, "Though I bear record of myself, my record is true, for I know whence I came and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I came, or whither I go, ye judge after the flesh."[1] Note that here, too, He says that He will return to the place from which He bears record that He previously had come down, sent down, that is, from heaven. He descended, then, from that place from which He came, just as He goes to that place from which He descended; it follows that if Christ were only man, He would not have come from that place, and so He could not depart to it, since He would not have come from it. Not so. By coming from that place from which a man cannot come, He showed that He came as God. It was just this descent which caused the heritage of ignorance and misconception to be left by the Jews to these heretics, to whom it is spoken, "Ye know not whence I come, nor whither I go, ye judge according to the flesh." Equally with the Jews, holding that the birth of Christ according to the flesh was His only birth, they are satisfied that He is nothing else but a man. They do not consider, that as a man could not come down from heaven, so as to be able accordingly to return to heaven, He Who descended from heaven, whence He could not come as man, is God.

[1] John viii. 14, 15.

Christ is not of this World

If Christ is only man, how does He say, "Ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world"?[1] Are we to infer, that, as every man is of this world, and as for that reason Christ is in this world,[2] therefore He is only man? God forbid. Mark what He says, "I am not of this world." Can any one suppose that He tells a lie, the truth being that He is of this world (as He is, if He is only man)? On the other hand, if He is not telling a lie, He is not of this world. No, He is not only a man; it is true that He is not of this world. To make it clear Who He was, He declared whence He was; "I am from above," that is, from heaven, whence a man cannot come. For man was not made in heaven. He Who is from above, then, is God, and therefore not of this world. In one sense, of course, He is of this world; this shows Him to be man as well as God. It is obviously as true that He is of this world according to the frailty of the flesh which He took upon Him, as that He is not of this world according to the Divinity of the Word. The fact is, that He is man joined with God, and God in union with man. But in this passage Christ deliberately emphasized the one side only, that of His Divinity. As the Jews in their blindness looked only at the carnal side of His Being, He passed over in silence the frailty, which is of the world, attaching to His body, and spoke here only of His Divinity, which is not of the world; His purpose being to lead them to weigh His claims to Divinity, so that they might believe Him to be truly God, with as

[1] John viii. 23.

[2] *i. e.* Christ, as Man, is "in this world." Therefore, say the heretics, He is also "of this world." But the two prepositions have not the same meaning; He is "in this world" as we are, but not "of this world."

much readiness as they had shown to believe Him to be only man. He wished to overcome their unbelief in regard to His Divinity, by forbearing to mention, for the time being, His human estate, but simply setting against it His Divinity.

Christ came forth from God

If Christ is only man, how does He say, "I proceeded forth and came from God," [1] when it is an accepted fact that man was made by God, and did not proceed forth from God? The Word of God proceeded forth from God, as man did not proceed; of Him it is said, "My heart hath brought forth a good word." Since this word is of God, it of course is with God; and as it was not uttered without effect,[2] it of course makes all things. For "all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made." But this Word, through Whom all things were made *is God*—"and the Word," John says, "was God." God then proceeded forth from God, since the Word Who proceeded forth is God, Who proceeded forth from God.

Christ promises Immortality

If Christ is only man, how does He say, "If any man keep my word, he shall never see death"?[3] "Never seeing death" is precisely the equivalent of "immortality." Now immortality is bound up with divinity, for divinity is immortal, and immortality is the natural result of divinity. But every man is mortal; and immortality

[1] John viii. 42.

[2] "He spake, and it was done." Nov. does not raise the question, whether "when the Father willed" (p. 134) that the Son should "proceed forth from Him" was at the time of Creation. As He says that God is timeless, while the world is not timeless, he would certainly not consider that the "generation" of the Son was coincident with creation, or for the purpose of creation.

[3] John viii. 51.

cannot spring from that which is mortal. So immortality cannot have its source in Christ as a mortal man. Yet He says, "He who guards my words, shall never see death." So the word of Christ bestows immortality, and through immortality,[1] divinity. I submit that one who is himself mortal cannot compass the work of making another immortal. Yet the word of Christ not only compasses this work, but actually bestows immortality. Assuredly, therefore, He is not only man, seeing that He bestows immortality, which He could not do, were He only man. Rather, by bestowing divinity through immortality, He proves Himself to be God, by His gift of divinity, which He could not bestow, if He were not God.

Christ is before Abraham

If Christ is only man, how does He say, "I am before Abraham"?[2] No man can be before him from whom he is sprung, indeed, it is impossible for anything whatever to be before him from whom it actually derived its beginning. Yet Christ, though He is descended from Abraham, says that He is before Abraham. Either He is a liar and a deceiver, if He, a descendant of Abraham, was not before Abraham, or He is not a deceiver—if He was before Abraham, and therefore is also God. If He had not been God, it is clear that as a descendant of Abraham He could not be before Abraham.

Christ gives Eternal Life

If Christ is only man, how does He say, "I shall know them, and my own follow me; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish for ever"?[3]

[1] Immortality can only spring from union with God; man can only be immortal through being "partaker of the divine nature" (2 Pet. i. 4; 1 John iii. 1) and this is through Christ.

[2] John viii. 58. [3] John x. 27.

Every man is bound by the laws of mortality, and therefore cannot keep even himself alive for ever; much less can he keep another man alive for ever. But Christ promises to give salvation for ever. If He does not give it, He is a liar; if He does, He is God. But He is not a deceiver; He gives what He promises. God then is He, Who bestows the gift of everlasting salvation, which a man, who cannot even keep himself alive, cannot grant to another.

Christ and the Father are One

If Christ is only man, what is the meaning of His saying "I and the Father are one?"[1] How can "I and the Father be one," if He is not both God and Son? He can only be said to be one with the Father, on the ground that He is of the Father, and is Son, and born of Him—found to have proceeded forth from Him. All this proves Him to be God as well as man. The Jews could not bear with this saying, and counted Him a blasphemer, because He had shown by the words in question that He was God; they snatched up stones, and went about to cast them at Him. But by Scripture precedent and witness He convincingly refuted His opponents. "If he called them gods," He says, "unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into this world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"[2] Not that He denied that He was God by this utterance; rather, He strengthened our assurance that He is God. For beyond question, they to whom the words of God came are called gods; much more is He God, Who proves to be better than them all. At the same time, by His solemn assertion

[1] In the Greek (John x. 30) "One" is in the neuter, "One Essence," not in the masculine, "One Person."

[2] John x. 35.

of His true relationship[1] to the Father, He gave to their slanderous blasphemy just the answer it required. He desires Himself to be understood to be God, but God in the sense of the Son of God, not of God the Father Himself. This is the point of the term He uses of Himself—"sent"—and of His declaration that He had "showed many works from the Father."[2] Evidently He desired Himself to be understood to be not the Father, but the Son. Again, in the last part of His defence He made mention of the Son, not of the Father: "Say ye, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" Thus in dealing with the charge of blasphemy, He says that He is the Son, not the Father, but so far as He was concerned with His Own Divinity, by the statement that "I and the Father are one," He proved that He is the Son, and God. He is then God; but God in the sense of Son, not of Father.

CHAPTER XVI

FURTHER SCRIPTURE PROOFS OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

Christ gives Eternal Life to those who believe in Him

If Christ is only man, how does He say of Himself: "And whosoever seeth and believeth in me shall never die"?[3] Remember, the man who trusteth in man bare

[1] Lat. "legitimate disposition." From the sense of "household management," "arrangement of the universe" (p 29), the word passes to that of "arrangement for salvation," "administration of divine grace" (chap. xviii. note); and as this reaches its culmination in the Incarnation, it is frequently used as equivalent to the Greek "economy," for the Incarnation i self. Tertullian says "that heretics erred because they did not understand the economy."

[2] John x. 32, 36. [3] John xi. 26.

and simple, is called accursed; here, on the contrary, he who trusts in Christ is not accursed, but is said to be never going to die. If He is only man, as the heretics would have it, how is it that whosoever believes in Him shall never die, when he that trusts in man is placed under a curse?[1] The alternative is, that since he who trusts in Christ is not accursed, but rather, as we read, marked out for the attainment of eternal life, Christ is not only man, but God; in Whom whosoever believes, not only casts beneath his feet the peril of the curse, but attains to the fruit of righteousness.

Christ sends the Paraclete, Who is therefore less than He

If Christ is only man, how does He say that the Paraclete will receive of that which is His, the things which He is going to show to the disciples? The Paraclete receives nothing from man, but bestows upon man knowledge; the Paraclete does not learn things to come from man, but instructs him concerning things to come. We have then two alternatives. Either the Paraclete did not receive His message from Christ, for no man will ever be able to give anything to the Paraclete, from Whom man himself has to receive; in that case Christ, in the passage we are considering, is a cheat and a deceiver,[2] when He says that the Paraclete will take of Him—a man—the things He will show. Or else, He is not deceiving us (no, He is not a deceiver!) and the Paraclete did receive His message from Christ. But if He received it from Christ, then Christ is greater than the Paraclete, since the Paraclete would not receive from Christ, unless He were less than[3] Christ. This inferiority

[1] Jer. xvii. 5.

[2] "Christ is either God, or He is not a good man."

[3] St. Jerome mentions the statement of another writer, that certain heretics, who "blaspheme against the Holy Spirit," had hawked this treatise in the streets of Constantinople, as supporting their

of the Paraclete at once proves that Christ, from Whom He received His message, is God. Here, then, is a strong testimony to the Divinity of Christ, when we find that the Paraclete is less than He, and takes of Him the message which He delivers to the world. If Christ were only man, He would receive from the Paraclete the message that He should speak; the Paraclete would not receive from Christ what He should show.

Christ couples His Own Name with that of the Father

If Christ is only man, why did He lay down for us a rule of faith in such terms as this: "This is life eternal, that they should know thee the one and true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent"?[1] If He did not wish Himself, as well as the Father, to be understood to be God, why did He add, "and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent," unless He wished to be acknowledged as God? Otherwise, He would have added, "and the man Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." But He made no such addition; the truth which He delivered to us was not that He was man only. He coupled Himself with God; such a conjunction could only mean, that He wished men to recognize Him also to be what He is—God. We are then to believe, according to the rule laid down, in the Lord, the one true God, and in logical sequence, in Jesus Christ, Whom He has sent. He

views. As the Son is "of the Father," "obedient to the Father," and therefore "less than the Father" (Chap. XXVI.), for "the Father is greater than I," so the Holy Spirit, who is sent by the Son from the Father, is "less than the Son." Inferiority or subordination in Person is not the same as inferiority in Essence. In man, desire rouses to action, mind discovers the means, will decides upon action or inaction; yet will is not essentially less than desire, though diverse from it, or desire than mind, all three being integral parts of the same self. See Jerome, *c. Rufin.* 19.

[1] John xvii. 3. Our Lord's own "Creed;" cf. p. 114. An "undogmatic Christianity" can hardly be in accordance with His will.

would never have coupled Himself, as we said, with the Father, unless He had wished to be acknowledged as God, as well as man. He would have distinguished Himself from God, if He had wished not to be acknowledged as God. In other words, He would have simply ranked Himself among men, if He had known Himself to be only man, and would not have coupled Himself with God, if He had not been certain that He was also God. The fact is, that He says nothing about His manhood, because no one doubted that He was man. He couples Himself with God for the best of reasons, to lay down the definition[1] of His Divinity for those who should believe.

Christ had Glory with the Father before the World was

If Christ be only man, how does He say, "And now glorify me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was"?[2] If, before the world was, He had glory with God, and held a position of exaltation, in the presence of the Father, clearly He existed before the world; for He could not have had this glory, unless He had existed before the world, so as to possess glory. No one who possesses anything can have it unless he exists before it. Now Christ has glory before the foundation of the world; it follows that He existed before the world. Unless He did exist before the foundation of the world, He could not have glory before the foundation of the world, when He did not exist Himself. Again, a man who came into existence after the world, could not have glory before the foundation of the world. Christ had this glory. Therefore Christ existed before the world; and, therefore, He was not only man, He Who existed before the world, and if not only man, He is God, since

[1] A lawyer's term (Lat. *formula*), used by Stoics.
[2] John xvii. 5.

He existed before the world, and possessed glory before the world.

The Glory which Christ had before the World was not in Predestination

Some say that Christ is speaking of predestination to glory.[1] But it is not so written; those who hold this opinion must add it to the written word. But woe is pronounced upon them that add unto,[2] equally with them that take away from, what is written. We cannot assert what we cannot add to the written word. We must then put aside predestination, as it is not mentioned. It was in substance[3] that Christ existed before the foundation of the world. He is "the Word," we remember, "through Whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made." Again, if it is asserted that He was glorious only in predestination, and that this predestination took place before the foundation of the world, the order of time must be observed, and we must infer that a vast number of men, before Christ, were predestinated to glory. Such predestination will show that Christ is less than other men, because He is obviously after them in time. If the glory of which He speaks was in predestination, Christ was the last to receive this predestination to glory; for we find Adam to have been so predestinated before Him, and Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and the rest. As the order of all persons and things is a matter of the divine arrangement, multitudes of men must be asserted to have been predestinated to glory, before the predestination of Christ. We must conclude, according

[1] 1 Pet. i. 20 may have given some support to this view. But the Apostle is speaking of the Sacrifice, not of the Person, of Christ; cf. Acts ii. 23.

[2] Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

[3] As before, *substantia* means "personal essence, essential being." The words are equivalent to the later formula, "Begotten of His Father before all worlds."

to this, that Christ is less than other men, He Who is admittedly better, and greater, and more ancient even than the angels.

Heretics may take their choice. Either they must cut out of the Scriptures all these passages, and rob Christ of His Divinity; or, if they cannot do that, they must restore to Him that Divinity which is rightly His.

CHAPTER XVII

THE TESTIMONY OF MOSES

All Things were made by the Word of God

I SUBMIT that Moses follows this same rule of truth, and at the very beginning of his writings left us a record from which we learn that all things were created and founded through the Son of God, that is, through the Word of God. He makes the same statement as John and the rest; indeed, we recognize that John and the rest received from him the truth that they assert. For while John says, "All things were made through him, and without him was nothing made," and the prophet says, "I speak of the things which I have made unto the king,"[1] Moses represents God as commanding first that light be made, then that the sky be firmly established, the waters gathered together, the dry land appear, the fruits of the earth be called forth according to their seeds, the animals be produced, the two great lights, and the stars, be set in the sky. Yet Moses shows that no other was present with God to receive the command that these things should be done, save He "through whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was

[1] Ps. xlv. 1.

made." And as He is the Word of God (for "My heart has uttered a good word") he shows that "the Word was in the beginning," and this "Word was with the Father," and further, that the "Word was God, all things were made through him." Once more, this "Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," that is to say, Christ, the Son of God. As we acknowledge Him to be, after the Incarnation, man according to the flesh, and see Him also to have been, before the foundation of the world, the Word of God, and God, we are right in believing and holding, according to the instruction of Old and New Testaments alike, that Christ Jesus is both God and man.

Man was made through the Word of God

Again, I submit that Moses represents God as saying, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,"[1] and below, "and God made man, in the image of God made he him, male and female created he them." It is the Word of God, as we have learnt to believe, through Whom all things were made; man, therefore, for whose sake all things were made, was certainly one of the things made through the Word of God. Now when God commands that man shall be made, He Who makes man is declared to be God; and it is the Son of God, that is to say, the Word of God "through whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made," Who makes man. This Word was made flesh

[1] Gen. i. 26, 27. The picture is that of a king in his council chamber announcing his purposes. It may be said generally of these Old Testament passages, that they prepared the minds of the Jews for the conception of a diversity within the Godhead, which philosophy shows to be logically necessary, while Revelation explains its nature so far as finite minds can grasp it and express it in words. The conception of God as a single Being is philosophically unthinkable; and if "God is love" from all eternity, and the social, as well as the individual, characteristics in man are also found in God, diversity within His Being is postulated.

and dwelt among us ; therefore Christ is God. So man was made through Christ, as it was through the Son of God. But God made man in the image of God ; therefore He Who made man in the image of God, is God ; therefore, again, Christ is God. Thus we have the assurance that the authority even of the Old Testament does not waver in regard to the Person of Christ, when we find it supported by the revelation of the New, nor is the force of the New Testament invalidated, resting as it does upon the foundations of this same Old Testament. Clearly, those who suppose that Christ, the Son of God and the Son of man, is only man, not God also, are acting contrary to the Old and to the New Testament alike, and undermining the truth of both.

The Descent to the Tower of Babel

Once more, I submit that Moses everywhere represents God as boundless and limitless ; He cannot be confined in space, for He includes all space. He is not in one place, but rather all place is in Him ; He contains all things, and embraces all things, so that He obviously cannot descend or ascend, as He contains all things and fills all things. Yet Moses represents God as going down to the tower which the sons of men were building, proposing to inspect it, and saying, "Come, and let us go down quickly, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." [1] What God do the heretics wish to have it, Who went down to the tower in this passage and proposed to visit these men? God the Father? In that case God is confined in a place ; how then does He embrace all things? Or can we imagine that Moses speaks of an angel going down with other angels, and saying, "Come, and let us go down quickly, and confound their language"?

[1] Gen. xi. 7.

On the contrary, a reference to Deuteronomy shows that it is God Who uttered these words, and God Who spoke: there it is written, "When he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the angels of God."[1] No further proof is needed, that it was not the Father Who went down, and no further proof that it was not an angel who gave the command. We can only conclude that He it was Who went down,[2] of Whom the Apostle Paul says, "He who descended, is the same also that ascended up above all heavens, that He might fill all things";[3] that is to say, the Son of God, the Word of God. But "The Word of God was made flesh, and dwelt among us," and this "Word of God," we find to be Christ. Therefore we must declare Christ to be God.

CHAPTER XVIII

FURTHER TESTIMONY OF MOSES: "THE ANGEL"

God, meaning the Son, the Image of God, was seen by Abraham

In another passage, we note that Moses says that "God appeared[4] unto Abraham." Yet the same Moses

[1] Deut. xxxii. 8. This is the rendering of the Septuagint, which perhaps follows a text which we do not now possess; or may have altered the words in deference to Greek readers, lest the special privilege accorded to the Jews should be distasteful to them.

[2] Not that the Son is less "limitless and boundless" than the Father; but that He, as deriving His Being from the Father, can be, and was, sent by Him to announce or to perform His will, in a manner which could be understood by men, *i.e.* in a visible form. But "will" with God is not, as with man, dependent upon circumstances, changeful, centred upon self; and the will of the Son is identical with that of the Father.

[3] Eph. iv. 10.

[4] Gen. xii. 7. I keep the translation of our A.V. The word for "appeared" through this passage is the same as "was seen."

hears from God, that "No man can see God, and live."[1] If God cannot be seen, how did He appear? Or if He appeared, how is it that He cannot be seen? John too says, "No man hath seen God at any time,"[2] and the Apostle Paul, "Whom no man hath seen nor can see."[3] Assuredly, Holy Scripture does not lie; God really was seen. We are led to understand that it was not the Father, Who never has been seen, that was here seen, but the Son, Who repeatedly descended to this earth, and so was seen. For He is "the image of the invisible God";[4] being so in order that weak and frail human nature might in time become accustomed to see, in Him[5] Who is the Image of God, that is, in the Son of God, God the Father.

For step by step, and by degrees, human frailty had to be brought up, by means of the Image, to endure the actual glory, so that in time it may be able to see God the Father. For all great forces, if they are suddenly brought to bear, are dangerous. Even the brightness of the sun, if it strike suddenly with excessive brilliance upon eyes long accustomed to darkness, will not reveal the light of day, but rather cause blindness. So provision is made against such injury to our physical eyes; the darkness little by little disappears and passes away, and the great luminary, deceiving us by the slowness of his rising, imperceptibly adds ray to ray, until our eyes are gradually accustomed to the light, and can bear the full glory of his mighty orb. In the same way Christ – that is to say, the Image of God and the Son of God – is presented to the eyes of men, so far as He was able to be seen; and so the frailty and weakness of human nature is nourished, trained and educated,

[1] Exod. xxxiii. 20.
[2] 1 John iv. 12.
[3] 1 Tim. vi. 16.
[4] Col. i. 15.
[5] This thought is repeated in chap. xxviii.

through Him, so that in time, through being accustomed to behold God the Son, it can "see" the Father Himself, "as He is."[1] Otherwise the sudden and unendurable brightness of His full glory would beat upon it and overwhelm it, so that it could never see God the Father, whom it has always longed to see. This God then, Who is seen, is the Son. But the Son of God is the Word of God, and the Word of God was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and He is Christ. What earthly[2] reason have we to hesitate to call Him God when we understand that He is proved in so many ways to be God?

The Angel who appeared to Hagar

Again. When Hagar, Sarah's handmaid, left her home, partly because she was driven out, partly because she wished to escape, she was met by an angel at a spring in the Shur road, who asked why she fled; and when he learned the reason, advised her to humble herself, holding out to her the hope that she should bear the title of mother. He promised that the seed of her womb should assuredly be a great nation, and that Ishmael was to be born of her, declaring, among other things, the place of his dwelling, and describing his manner of life. Now Scripture sets this angel before us as both Lord and God; for He would not have promised a blessing upon her seed if He had not been both angel and God. Heretics must consider what to make of this passage. Was it the Father Who was seen by Hagar, or not? For it is declared that He was God. God forbid that we should call the Father an angel; that would make the Father subject to another being whose angel He is. They will say then that He was only an

[1] 1 John iii. 2.

[2] Quæ, malum, ratio . . . ? "A startling colloquialism" (Fausset).

angel. How, then, if He was only an angel, can He be God? The name God has never been granted to angels ;[1] the only possible view, to which we are driven by a truthful recognition of both sides *of His Personality*, is that He was the Son of God. He, being of God, is called God, and rightly so, seeing that He is the Son of God, and as He is in subjection to the Father, and declares the Father's will, He is entitled "The angel of great counsel."[2] Our passage, then, cannot be applied to the Person of the Father, for then we call the Father an angel ; nor to the person of an angel, for then we call the angel God. It does harmonize with the Person of Christ, that He be both God, because He is the Son of God, and also angel, because He declares the administration[3] of His Father. Heretics must understand, that they are contradicting the Scriptures, when they say that they believe that Christ was both man and angel, but will not declare Him to be both man and God, Him of Whom they read in the Old Testament that He ofttimes came to visit the children of men.

The Angel who appeared to Abraham

Continuing the history of Abraham, Moses says that God appeared to Abraham at the oak of Mamre, as he was sitting at the door of his tent at midday, and that though he saw three men, he yet addressed one of them as Lord. He washes their feet, sets before them cakes baked on the ashes, butter and milk in abundance from his own herd, and urges them to stay and eat as his guests.

[1] *i. e.* In the sense of "God the Creator." Contrast p. 92. The word "angel" properly means "a messenger" ; he must therefore be sent. God could not send Himself.

[2] This is the Septuagint translation of our word "Counsellor" in Isa. ix. 6. The Latin Vulgate follows the Hebrew, "Consiliarius."

[3] Lat. "dispositio" ; cf. notes in chaps. vi. and xv. Here the word includes the spiritual as well as the creative "ordering" or "economy" of the universe.

Then he is told that he is going to be a father; he learns that Sarah, his wife, is going to bear him a son; he is informed of the well-deserved destruction in store for the citizens of Sodom; and finally, learns that God has come down to earth because of the cry of the men of Sodom. If the heretics wish to make out that in this passage it was the Father Who was hospitably received, together with two angels, they declare their belief that the Father is visible. If they prefer the idea that it was an angel, why is an angel called by the unusual title of God, one of the three being addressed as Lord? Here is the only explanation, by which alone His due invisibility may be secured for God the Father, and His due inferiority left to the angel. It was no other than the Son of God, Who is also God, that we must believe to have appeared to Abraham, and been hospitably entertained by him. As Abraham's guest, He rehearsed in a mystery [1] that which He was one day to be, when He came among the sons of Abraham; for He washed their feet to show that it was He Himself, thus paying back to Abraham's sons the right of hospitality, which their father had long before advanced to Him.[2]

The Lord rained upon Sodom from the Lord

The language of Holy Scripture in regard to the destruction of the cities of Sodom excludes all doubt that it was He Who was Abraham's guest, "when the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and sulphur from the Lord out of heaven."[3] So the prophet, speaking in the name[4] of God says, "I have overcome you, as the Lord overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah."[5] The

[1] As before (Chap. I.) "in a sacrament." He "was one day to be" the host of Abraham's sons.

[2] Nov. does not see in the three men a type of the Trinity.

[3] Gen. xix. 24.

[4] As on p. 56. "From the Person."

[5] Amos iv. 11

Lord, then, overthrew Sodom, that is to say, God overthrew Sodom. But in the overthrow of Sodom, it was the Lord that rained fire, from the Lord. This Lord appeared to Abraham as God; this God is Abraham's guest, assuredly seen, because touched, by him. But the Father, Who is invisible, assuredly was not seen by Abraham. He Who was seen, and was hospitably received and entertained, was He Who was frequently touched and seen; He, the Son of God, and the Lord, "rained sulphur and fire from the Lord." He is the Word of God, and "The Word of God was made flesh, and dwelt among us." He is Christ. It was not then the Father Who was Abraham's guest, but the Son; it was not the Father Who was seen, but the Son; it was Christ Who was seen. It follows that Christ is the Lord, and God, Who could appear to Abraham only because, before Abraham himself was, God, the Word, was begotten of God the Father.

Further Comment on the Appearance of the Angel to Hagar

Further, Moses tells us, this same angel, who is also God, visits and consoles Hagar, when she fled from Abraham's house with her son. She had cast the child away in the wilderness, as the water was spent in the bottle, and when he cried she lifted up her voice and wept. "And God," Scripture says, "heard the voice of the lad from the place where he was."[1] After declaring that it was God Who heard the voice of the lad, it adds, "And the angel of the Lord called unto Hagar out of heaven." It calls Him angel Whom it has just called God, and declares Him to be Lord Whom it had just represented as angel. This Person, Who is both angel and God, promises to Hagar yet greater consolations,

[1] Gen. xxi 17.

saying, "Fear not, for I have heard the voice of the lad from the place where he was. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him; for I will make him a great nation." Why does this angel, if he be only angel, claim for himself the power to say, "For I will make him a great nation"? This kind of power assuredly belongs to God; it cannot belong to an angel. Thus the claim confirms our belief that He is God Who has this power.

A further proof is given by Scripture immediately afterwards: "And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of living water, and she went, and filled the bottle with water, and gave the lad drink, and God was with the lad." So this Person, Who was with the lad, Who opened the eyes of Hagar, so that she saw the well of living water, and drew water from it to satisfy his burning thirst, was God. He Who calls to her out of heaven was God. And yet He is called "Angel," though earlier in the narrative, when He heard the voice of the lad crying, the title which the writer prefers to use is God. The only intelligible explanation is, that He is both angel and God. Such a description cannot be appropriate and suitable to the Father, Who is God only; but it can be appropriately applied to Christ, Who has been declared to be not God only, but also angel. It is obvious, therefore, that it was not the Father Who spoke to Hagar in the present passage, but Christ; since He is not only God, but One to Whom the title of angel is also appropriate, by virtue of His being made "the angel of great counsel"—Angel, as declaring *the inmost purpose*[1] in the bosom

[1] Lit. "Declares the bosom of the Father" (from John i. 18). The italics in our Bibles show that there is no word in the Greek for "him"; Nov. and some other early writers evidently supplied "it" instead of "him," meaning the "bosom."

of the Father, as John declares. For seeing that John says that this Person, Who reveals the inmost purpose of the Father, was made flesh, so that He might be able to declare this purpose, it follows that Christ is not man only, but also angel; and He is shown in the Scriptures to be not angel only, but God also. Such is our Christian belief. Otherwise, if we refuse to acknowledge that it was Christ Who spoke to Hagar in this passage, we must either make an angel God, or reckon God the Father among the angels.

CHAPTER XIX

OTHER APPEARANCES OF "THE ANGEL"

The Angel Who appeared to Jacob

I ADDUCE another similar passage, in which we read of God described as an angel. When Jacob was complaining to his wives, Leah and Rachel, of the harsh dealings of their father, saying that now he desired to make his way back, and return to his native land, he alleged, besides his own feelings, the authority of a dream he had seen, in which, he tells them, the angel of God had called to him, "Jacob, Jacob."[1] "And I," he continues, "said, What is it? And he said, Lift up thine eyes, and see the goats and rams leaping upon the sheep, and the she-goats streaked with white, variegated, speckled, and spotted. For I have seen all that Laban hath done unto thee. I am God who appeared unto thee in the place of God,[2] where thou

[1] Gen. xxxi. 11–13.

[2] This is the Septuagint translation of Bethel—"the house of God."

anointedst the pillar unto me, and vowedst a vow unto me. Now therefore arise, and get thee out from the land, and go unto the land of thy birth, and I will be with thee." Seeing that the angel of God so speaks to Jacob, and this angel himself proceeds to assert that "I am God who appeared to thee in the place of God," we can have no hesitation in recognizing that we have One presented to us Who is not only angel but God also, since He declared that Jacob's vow was addressed to Him "in the place of God," and does not say "In my place." He is therefore the place of God; He Who speaks also is God.[1] Further, the words are simply "in the place of God"; not "in the place of the angel and of God," but only "of God." So He Who makes these promises, is stated to be God and angel. Clearly, then, there is a distinction between Him Who is called God only, and Him Who is declared to be not simply God, but God and angel. It follows that as there is no other angel whose authority we can allow to stand so high that He can profess Himself to be God as well as angel, and bear witness that a vow has been made to Himself, except Christ alone (to Whom a vow can be offered not as angel only, but as God), it is plain that we cannot recognize Him to be the Father, but the Son, Who is both God and angel. But if He is Christ, as is the case, that man stands in awful danger, who says that Christ is man only, or angel only, withdrawing from Him the power which belongs to the Divine Name, a power again and again attributed to Him on the assurance of the heavenly Scriptures, which again and again call Him both angel and God.

[1] *i.e.* God, Whose "place" was where Jacob anointed the pillar, is different from Him Who appeared.

The Man with Whom Jacob wrestled

There is yet more to be said. Just as the Divine Scripture again and again asserts that Christ is both angel and God, it similarly asserts that He is both man and God, when explaining that which He was to be, and representing in figure, long before the event, that nature which he was to have in very substance. "Jacob," we read,[1] remained "alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day; and he saw that he prevailed not against him, and touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh, as he wrestled with him," and he with Him, "and he said to him, Let me go, for the morning star riseth. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And he said, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said unto him, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel shall thy name be; for thou hast prevailed with God, and with men thou art powerful." And he further added, "And Jacob called the name of that place, Vision[2] of God; for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved. And the sun rose upon him, as presently he passed over Vision of God; and he halted upon his thigh." A man, it says, wrestled with Jacob. If he is a bare man, who is he? Whence comes he? Why does he strive and wrestle with Jacob? What had come between them? What had taken place? What was the meaning of that mighty strife and struggle? Why, further, do we find that Jacob, who, as we see, is strong enough to hold the man with whom he wrestled, and asks a blessing from him whom he held because the morning star was rising, made his

[1] Gen. xxxii. 24 ff.

[2] The Heb. "Peniel" means "the face of God." Nov. follows the Septuagint.

request for that particular reason?[1] It can only be because the strife between Christ and the sons of Jacob, which was then in the future, but is recorded in the Gospel to have been actually accomplished, was here prefigured. Against this man the people of Jacob did indeed wrestle; it proved the more powerful in the struggle, winning the victory of its own unrighteousness over Christ, and at once, in punishment for the crime it had committed, began to halt most seriously in the gait of its own faith and salvation, stumbling and slipping as it went. That people, though it was shown, by its condemnation of Christ, to be the stronger, yet needs His pity, yet needs His blessing. But to continue. This man, who wrestled with Jacob, says to him, "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel shall thy name be." By giving him this name, which means, "the man who sees God,"[2] the Lord gracefully shows that He Who had been wrestling with Jacob, was not a man only, but also God. Assuredly Jacob saw God, his opponent in the struggle, though it was a man whom he held in his grip. And to remove all doubt upon the matter, He Himself gave the interpretation of the new name, saying, "For thou hast prevailed with God, and with man thou art powerful." This is why Jacob, conscious already of the meaning of the mystery, and divining the authority of Him with Whom he had wrestled, called the name of the place where the struggle had taken place, "Vision of God." Moreover, he added his reason for doing so, to give us the key to the interpretation of "Vision of God"; "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." So he saw God,

[1] *i.e.* Because Christ is "the day-star from on high," "the bright and morning star."

[2] Nov.'s etymology is at fault. "Israel" means "God striveth," or "he who striveth with God."

and wrestled with Him as with a man; but while he held a man in his grip, as victor, as an inferior he asked of him a blessing, as from God. Thus he wrestled both with God and with a man. Now if the historical struggle between Christ and the people of Jacob was here prefigured, and has been actually accomplished in the Gospel, a struggle in which the people proved the more powerful, and yet was found to be the weaker, by the proofs of its guilt; who would hesitate to recognize Christ, in Whom this figurative struggle was realized, as not man only but also God, when he sees that the figurative struggle itself proves that He is both man and God?

The Angel invoked by Jacob in his Blessing of the Boys

Even this is not the last instance in which the Divine Scripture calls an angel God, and God an angel. When this same Jacob was about to bless Manasseh and Ephraim, the sons of Joseph, he placed his hands crosswise upon the heads of the lads, and said, "God, Who feedeth me from my youth up unto this day, the angel which hath delivered me from all evil, bless these lads."[1] So definitely does he declare Him to be an angel Whom he had called God, that in his closing words he brings in the Person, in the singular number, of Whom he was speaking, saying, "May he bless these lads." If he had wished one God, and one angel, to be understood, he would have joined the two persons together, with a verb in the plural; but, in fact, he used the singular number, for one Person, in pronouncing his blessing. Clearly, he wished God and the angel to be understood to be the same Person. We cannot take God the Father to be an angel; but we can take Christ to be both God and angel. And by laying his hands crosswise on the

[1] Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.

heads of the boys, Jacob showed that Christ was the bestower of the blessing, implying that He was their Father,[1] and therefore laying his hands in such a way as to foreshow the form and fashion of His future passion. Let no one then hesitate to call Christ God, any more than to call Him angel, when he understands that He was invoked, as both God and angel, to give His blessing to the lads, through the mysterious sign[2] of the passion, given in the figure of the crossed hands.

CHAPTER XX

THE NAME OF GOD IS GRANTED TO ANGELS AND TO MEN

Angels are called gods; much more may Christ

And if any heretic, obstinately struggling against the truth, is resolved to understand, or insists that it must be understood, that an angel is spoken of without qualification in all these instances, he must be shattered by the force of truth, by the following consideration. As all things in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, are given in subjection to Christ, the angels are included among these things; for there are no exceptions. Yet any angel, though in subjection to Christ, can be, and is, called god,[3] and the title is given without blasphemy. Much more then, assuredly, is it appropriate to Christ Himself, the Son of God, that He should be declared

[1] It is the father's office to bless; Christ blesses the boys through their father Jacob.

[2] Again, "sacramentum."

[3] On p. 83 it is said that the name of God has never been granted to angels; that is to say in the sense of the omnipotent Creator. Their "subjection" marks them off from Him as God in the primary sense.

to be God. In other words, if an angel, who is in subjection to Christ, is set before us as God, much more, and more fittingly, will Christ, to Whom all angels are in subjection, be said to be God. For it is contrary to the nature of things, that what is granted to the less, should be denied to the greater. Since then an angel is less than God, and yet an angel is called god, it follows that Christ, Whom we find to be both greater and better, not than one angel, but than all, is called God more properly than they.

The Name of "God" is given to Judges

Again. "God stood in the congregation of gods,[1] God in the midst doth judge the gods." Now Christ often stood in the congregation. As God, then, He stood in the congregation, judging between the gods, to whom He says: "How long do ye accept the persons of men?" that is to say, accusing the men of the congregation for their unrighteous judgments—as He was entitled to do. Further, since the men who are reproved and blamed, none the less appear for some reason to receive, without blasphemy, this name, so that they can be called gods, much more, assuredly, shall He be held to be God, Who is said not only to have stood in the congregation of gods, but is actually shown to us, by the authority of the same passage, deciding and judging

[1] Ps. lxxxii. 1; John x. 34. The most usual Hebrew word for "God" is Elohim, a plural word (a plural of dignity, like the "we" used by our kings) meaning "mighty ones." As the four lettered word which we incorrectly vocalize as "Jehovah" might not be pronounced, "Elohim" was substituted for it in reading the Scriptures. But "Elohim" is also used for "judges" (*e.g.* in Exod. xxi. 6), as being "mighty ones," deriving their might from God, the source of all justice. Just as Solomon's throne is called "the throne of Jehovah," as reflecting His majesty and embodying His rule, so the dispensers of justice were considered to utter His pronouncements, since He is the final Judge and Source of Justice. In the Incarnate Son of God this Judgeship finds its highest realization.

between gods. Further yet, if the men who "fall like one of the princes" are yet called gods, much more shall He be said to be so called, Who not only does not fall like one of the princes, but vanquishes the very originator and prince of wickedness.

The Name of "god" was given to Moses

Yes, and for what earthly reason, when they read that this name was given to Moses, in the words, "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh,"[1] should they deny it to Christ, Whom we find to have been appointed not to be a god to Pharaoh, but to be to the whole creation both Lord and God? Moreover, in the one case, the name was given within limits, in the other, unreservedly; in the one case, by measure, in the other, beyond all measure whatever ("for the Father," Scripture saith, "giveth not by measure unto the Son," "for the Father loveth the Son");[2] in the one, for a time, in the other, without reckoning of time. For Christ received the power of the Divine Name, not only over all things, but for all time. But, if Moses, who received power over one man, in spite of the narrow limits within which the power was given him, is without hesitation granted the name of god, how much more shall we believe that Christ, Who has power over Moses himself, as over other things, has the authority of the Name given to Him?

CHAPTER XXI

THE LANGUAGE OF THE GOSPELS AND EPISTLES

The Temple of His Body

Now I might very well winnow the statements of all the heavenly Scriptures, and stir a mighty forest, if I

[1] Exod. vii. 1.

[2] John iii. 34, 35.

may use the expression, in regard to this question[1] of Christ's Divinity; but I have not proposed to myself to contravert this particular heresy, so much as to explain briefly the rule of truth in regard to the Person of Christ. However, though I must hasten on to other matters, I do not think I ought to pass by an expression of the Lord in the Gospel, significant of His majesty: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it again";[2] and another pronouncement, in a different place, and in a different context: "I have power to lay down my life, and to take it again; this command I have received of the Father."[3] Who is this Who says that He has power to lay down His life, or that He can take it again, because He has received this command of the Father? Or Who says that, when the temple of His body has been destroyed, He can revive it again, and rebuild it? The answer is, that that Word, Who is "of the Father," Who is "with the Father," "through whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made,"[4] He Who is like to His Father in His works and powers, "the image of the invisible God," Who "came down from heaven," Who "testified what he hath seen and heard," Who "came not to do his own will, but" rather "to do the will of the Father," by Whom He had been sent for this very purpose, that He, being made "the angel of great counsel," might reveal to us the laws of heavenly secrets, and Who as "the Word made flesh, dwelt among us"[5]—He is this Christ, Who is of us,[6] proved to be not man only, because Son of man, but also God, because Son of God.

[1] Lat. *species;* a law term for a "case" to be considered.
[2] John ii. 19. [3] John x. 18. [4] John i. 3.
[5] Col. i. 15; John iii. 31, 32; vi. 38; Isa. ix. 6; John i. 14.
[6] "Of us," in His Human Nature, corresponding to "of the Father" above.

Christ the Firstborn of every Creature

Again, Christ is called by the Apostle "the firstborn of all creation."[1] How could He be the firstborn of all creation, unless by virtue of His Divinity He came forth from God the Father, as the Word, before all creation? If the heretics do not accept this interpretation, they will be compelled to show that Christ is the firstborn of all creation as man; and this they will find they cannot do. Either, then, He is before all creation, so as to be the firstborn of all creation, and then is not man only, for man is after all creation; or else He is man only, and is therefore after all creation. And how is He the firstborn of all creation, if not by virtue of His being the Word, Who is before creation? As the firstborn of all creation in this sense, He is made flesh and dwells among us, that is, He assumes this manhood, which is after all creation, and thus, with it, and in it, dwells among us, so that neither is the manhood withheld from Christ, nor is His Divinity denied. If He is before all creation only, the manhood in Him is withheld; and if He is man only, His Divinity, which is before all creation, is invalidated. Both then are linked[2] together in Christ, both are joined, both bound into one; seeing that there is something in Him which is superior to all creation, we are sure that we have here a guarantee of the harmony between the Divinity and the humanity in Him. This is why He Who is expressly declared to have been made "the Mediator between God and man"[3] united[4] in Himself, as we find, both God and man.

[1] Col. i. 15. A text used by later heretics to prove that Christ is a creature, like other men.

[2] Lat. "confœderatum," "bound as by a treaty."

[3] 1 Tim. ii. 5.

[4] Lat. "sociavit," "allied."

Christ put off the Flesh, which He must, therefore, have put on

Again, the same apostle tells us of Christ, that "He having put off the flesh, dishonoured powers, triumphing over them openly in himself."[1] Assuredly he did not employ the phrase "put off the flesh" without a definite meaning; he must have wished it to be understood that He put it on again in His resurrection. Who is this, that puts off, and again puts on, the flesh? Let the heretics search it out. We know that it was the Word of God that put on the substance[2] of flesh, and likewise put it off again, in one and the same material body, which He again took in His resurrection, and resumed as one would a garment. Now, had Christ been only a man, He would neither have put off, nor put on, manhood; for no one is ever spoiled of himself, or clothed with himself. It must always of necessity be something else, which is taken as spoil from some one else, or put on as clothes. It is clear then that it was the Word of God, Who put off the flesh, and in His resurrection clothed Himself with flesh again; He could put it off, because He had clothed Himself with it in His birth. So it is God Who in Christ is put on, and it must be also God that was put off, for the reason that

[1] Col. ii. 15. Our A.V. translates, "Having spoiled principalities and powers." But just above (Col. ii. 11, "putting off the body of the flesh") and below (Col. iii. 9, "put off the old man;" cf. 2 Cor. v. 2) the same word is used, and it would be strange for St. Paul to use it in a different sense here. Nov., like most of the Latin Fathers, understands that the Lord "spoiled" or "stript off" from Himself "the flesh" (the R.V. has "the body," in the margin), while "principalities" is the object of the verb "made a show of," not of the participle "having stripped." This is the more likely, as this participle is in the middle, not in the active voice. Nov. seems to make his own translation, as it is not found in any of the ancient versions.

[2] "Substance" and "material" are again contrasted, as in Chap. V.

He Who is put on must of necessity be the same as He Who is put off. But He puts on, and puts off, manhood as though His body were a woven garment. In logical consequence it was the Word of God, as we said, Whom we find to have at one time put on, at another put off, the flesh.

The Garment washed in Wine, and the Clothes in the Blood of the Grape

Indeed, He foretold this in the words of His blessing, "He shall wash his garment in wine, and his clothes in the blood of the grape."[1] If, in Christ, the garment is His flesh, and the clothes His body, the question arises, Who is this, Whose body is His clothes, and His flesh His garments? To us it is clear, that the flesh is the garment, and the body the clothes, of the Word, Who washed the substance of the body and the material of the flesh, in the blood of the grape, that is, in wine, cleansing it, in regard to the human nature which He had taken upon Him by His passion. It follows that as He is washed, it is as man, because the garment which is washed is flesh; but He Who washes it is the Word of God, Who, in order to wash the garment, was made the wearer of the garment. He is clearly declared to be man by the substance which was taken that it might be washed, just as He Who washed it is shown to be God, by the authority of the Word.

[1] Gen. xlix. From Jacob's blessing to Judah, from whom "the sceptre shall not depart." The words promise earthly prosperity; but the mention of "blood," though purely metaphorical, for "juice" suggests the thought, that only through sacrifice can the highest goal be won, and this truth received its fullest realization in the Passion.

CHAPTER XXII

ST. PAUL'S LANGUAGE IN PHILIPPIANS II. EXAMINED

Being in the Form of God

Now I have said that I must hasten on to another part of our discussion, but I must not pass by the well-known passage of the apostle—"who though he was in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal to God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being made in the likeness of men, and found in guise as a man; he humbled himself, being made obedient even so far as to death, and that the death of the cross: wherefore, also, God exalted him exceedingly, and gave him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord in the glory of God the Father." "Who though he was in the form[1] of God," he says. If Christ were man only, He would have been described as "in the image of God," not "in the form of God"; for we know that man was made in the image, not in the form, of God. Who, then, is this, Who was made "in the form of God," this—angel? Why, we do not read of the form of God even in connection with angels; there is but One, this Son of God, incomparable and noble above all, the Word of God, Who in all His works is like unto[2] His Father, Himself working as His Father works—He alone is, as we have asserted, in the form of God the Father. Rightly has He been declared to be in the form of God,

[1] Not that God has a form, in our sense of something material and visible. St. Paul chooses the word to express identity of Essence, without identity of Person, simply because there was no possibility of his readers interpreting it in a material sense.

[2] Lat. "imitator."

seeing that He is above all, and holds divine authority over every creature, and is God after the pattern[1] of the Father; yet this is by gift from God, Who is peculiarly His Father,[2] that He might be both God and Lord of all, and God, according to the form of God the Father, begotten and brought forth from Him.

"He thought it not Robbery"

He, then, though "He was in the form of God, thought it not robbery[3] to be equal to God." For although He bore in mind that He was God, of God the Father, He never compared or ranked Himself with God the Father, mindful that He was of His Father, and that He holds the place He does, because the Father had given it to Him. Hence it is that both before and after He took upon Him the body of flesh, and again, after His resurrection, He rendered, and does render, all obedience, in all things, to the Father. All this proves that He never thought of His Divinity as a kind of usurpation,[4] that He should make Himself equal to God the Father; on the contrary, He was obedient[5] and

[1] Lat. "exemplum"—as a first line in a copy-book.

[2] Lit. "from His very own Father."

[3] Lat. "rapina." The exact meaning of the Greek word is doubtful. The R.V. has "a prize" in the margin; "a thing to be grasped," *i. e.* "a thing which He would not surrender," explaining, "he humbled himself." Nov. and the Latin Fathers generally seem to understand it to mean "a form of grasping" (so Fausset), an arrogation to Himself of that which is not His. He did not claim to be "equal with God" as the "Fountain of Godhead," the Creator, seeing that it is "through Him," not "by Him," that all things were made.

[4] "Rapina." I translate it so here, to make the meaning more clear.

[5] "Obedient," because there could be no contradiction of will within the Divine Being. The Father is not all wrath, the Son all mercy, as Milton's poem suggests. The will of God springs from the Father; yet the carrying out of that will does not imply inferiority of the Son within the perfect personality of God, in Whom there can be but one will.

subject to His Father's rule and will in all things, content even to take upon Himself the form of a slave—that is, to be made the Man of Whom we know—and the substance of flesh and body, which He took upon Himself at His birth, as it came to Him from the slavery of the sins of His forefathers [1] according to His manhood.

"He emptied Himself"

It was then that He emptied Himself, not disdaining to take upon Himself the human frailty that His new condition of existence involved. For if He had been born as a man only, He would not have been emptied thereby. A man is made the greater, not emptied, by being born; he begins to be something which could not be his when he did not exist, so that he is not emptied, as we said, but rather is made the greater and the richer. It was not so with Christ. He is emptied by the very fact of His birth, in taking upon Him the form of a slave. How, then, is He man only? If He were, it would have been more true to say that He was enriched by the incident of His birth, not emptied; as a matter of fact, the authority of the Divine Word, condescending for a time to take upon Himself manhood, and laying aside the full exercise of His powers, lowers and deposes Himself, for so long as He bears the manhood which He has taken upon Himself. He empties Himself,[2] so long as He stoops to bear insults and abuse, listens to blasphemies, and submits to indignities.

[1] His human forefathers were "slaves of sin," and in taking human nature He took upon Him this "form," with its liability to sin, that through breaking the bonds of sin by sinlessness, He might set it free. St. Paul can hardly have meant more than is implied in the words "I am among you as he that serveth."

[2] Nov. does not allude to the limitations of Christ's knowledge as man. Infinite knowledge can only belong to an infinite mind; it would not be true to say that as man He had an infinite mind. Of this He had "emptied Himself."

The "Name above Every Name"

Yet at once His humility bears noble fruit; for He received "the name [1] which is above every name"—the name which assuredly we can only understand to be the name of God. For it belongs to God alone to be above all things; it follows that that name, which is above every name, is His only, Who is above all things. For the name which is above every name is the name of God; this name must then of necessity belong to Him, Who, though He had been in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal to God. Indeed, if Christ were not God, every knee of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, would not bow at His name; things visible and invisible, and the whole creation, would not be in subjection and subservience to a man. It would remember that it existed before man.

The Conclusion from the above Language

To sum up. Christ is said to be "in the form of God." He is shown to have emptied Himself, even so far as to be born according to the flesh; He is declared to have received from the Father the name which is above every name; it is shown that every knee, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, bend and bow down at His name, and, strange as it may seem, it is asserted that this redounds to the glory of God the Father. It follows, that He is man, not only because He was made obedient even so far as to suffer death, and that the death of the cross, but not man only, seeing that from all these considerations, which shout

[1] Latin has no article, definite or indefinite; Greek has a definite article. Our A.V. incorrectly has "a name" instead of St. Paul's "the name." "Name" to a Jew implied personality; every knee shall bow, not "at the name Jesus"—whenever the name is uttered—but "at the name"—the personality "of Jesus."

aloud the Divinity of Christ, the Lord Jesus Christ is proved, in despite of the wishes of the heretics, to be God as well as man.

CHAPTER XXIII

HERESY ITSELF A PROOF OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

The Heresy that Christ is the Father

At this point I will take the liberty of drawing some arguments from the ground taken by other heretics; it is a strong line of proof which is borrowed from an opposing party, so that the truth is confirmed by the very enemies of the truth. So clear is it that Christ is represented in the Scriptures to be God as well as man, that very many heretics, in their dismay at the majesty and truth of His Divinity, have actually gone beyond limit in the honours they allow to Him, and presumed to teach, or at least to think, that He is not the Son, but God the Father Himself.[1] This is, of course, contrary to scriptural truth; yet it is a powerful and specially cogent argument for the Divinity of Christ. So indisputably is He God (but God as the Son of God, born of God), that very many heretics, as we said, have accepted His Godhead so far as to hold that He must be declared to be, not the Son, but the Father. We leave the matter to their judgment; is He, or is He not, God, Whose authority has so much weighed with some people, that, as we said, they acknowledge the Divinity in Christ

[1] A certain Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote a treatise, taught that the Son was personally, not essentially, one with the Father; and that, therefore, it was the Father who suffered upon the Cross. Hence his followers were called "Patripassians," or "Sabellians," from a disciple of his (p. 59).

even beyond the proper restraints and reservations, and actually hold that He is God the Father Himself, compelled to do so by His manifest Divinity, so that, though they read of Him as the Son, the consideration of His Godhead has led them to regard Him as the Father?

The Heresy of a Non-human Christ

Other heretics, again, have so far grasped the manifest Divinity of Christ, as to say that He was without flesh, and so have robbed Him entirely of the human nature which He took upon Himself, for fear of evacuating the power of the Divine Name in Him, by associating with Him, according to their own ideas, a human birth. We cannot accept this view; but we do bring it forward as an argument, that Christ is clearly God, that some people withhold from Him His manhood, and regard Him as God only, while others believe Him to be God the Father. Whereas the proportion and reserve of the heavenly Scriptures show that Christ is God, but God as the Son of God, and on the other hand, that He must be believed to be also man, in that the Son of man has been taken into the Godhead. For if He entered into manhood that He might be the Mediator between God and man, He had to be with man, and the Word had to become flesh in order that He might rivet together in Himself the harmony between things earthly and things heavenly, combining in Himself the pledges required on either side, and linking together God with man, and man with God, that the Son of God may really be made the Son of man, through the assumption of the flesh, and the Son of man really be made the Son of God through the receiving into itself of God the Word. This most deep and hidden mystery,[1] determined in God's purposes before the ages for the salvation of the human race, is

[1] Again, "sacramentum."

found to have its fulfilment in the Lord Jesus Christ, both God and man, that the lowly estate of human nature might be brought to the enjoyment of eternal salvation.

CHAPTER XXIV

HERETICAL VIEWS EXAMINED

The Son of God Distinct from the Son of Man

Now the source from which has sprung this error of the heretics, is, I think, this: they consider that there is no difference between the Son of God and the Son of man. They are afraid that if such a distinction is made, Jesus Christ will easily be proved to be both man and God. They desire to make out that He, the Son of man and also the Son of God, is one and the self-same person, so that the man, the flesh, the frail bodily substance, is said to be the same as the Son of God Himself; with the result, that as no distinction can be observed between the Son of man and the Son of God, but the Son of man Himself is evinced to be the Son of God, they can assert that Christ, as man only, is the same as the Son of God.[1] By this argument they try to shut out of consideration the words: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us";[2] and "Thou shalt call his name Emmanuel, which is interpreted, God is with us."[3]

The Angelic Message to Mary urged in Proof of the Heresy

They bring forward and allege in proof of their contention, the words of the Gospel of Luke; on the

[1] In that case, the full meaning of the "Son of God" would be found exhaustively in Jesus, the carpenter of Nazareth.

[2] John iv. 14. [3] Is. vii. 14.

strength of which they endeavour to maintain, not the truth as it really is, but only what they wish to hold. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; therefore, also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."[1] Since then, they allege, the angel of God says to Mary, "That holy thing which shall be born of thee," the substance of flesh and blood is derived from Mary; this substance, that is to say, the holy thing which was born of her, the angel declared to be the Son of God. The man, they continue, and the flesh of the body which He bore, that thing which is said to be holy, is itself the Son of God; so that we are to understand, since the Scripture speaks of a "holy thing," that Christ the Son of man is a man, and since it sets before us the "Son of God," we must find in Him not God but a man.

The True Significance of the Words

But the Divine Scripture readily lays bare and vanquishes the deceits and filchings[2] of heretics. If the words were only, "The Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," perhaps we should have to carry on the struggle with them by a different method, look for different arguments, and take up different weapons, with which to defeat their ambuscades and sophistries. As, however, the Scripture in itself, in its heavenly completeness, clears itself of the slanders of these heretics, we can readily rely upon the written word, and without any hesitation overcome these errors.

[1] Luke i. 35.

[2] Lat. "thefts." I use Hooker's expression. They "filched" from Him His Godhead.

The Scripture, as we have shown, did not say, "Therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee," but adds a conjunction; the words are, "Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee."[1] This was to show, that the holy thing which is being born of her, that is, the substance of flesh and of body which He bore, is not primarily but inferentially, and in the secondary place the Son of God; while primarily it is the Word of God that is the Son of God—the Word incarnate through the Spirit, of Whom the angel tells her that "The spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee." This is the Son of God by actual right of birth,[2] Who is of God Himself, and by taking upon Himself that "holy thing," and attaching to Himself the Son of man, laying hold of him, and drawing him close to Himself, by this near association and commingling with Himself, bestows upon him that which he was not by nature, and so makes him the Son of God.[3] Thus the primary[4] application of the name "Son of God" is to the Word, Who descended

[1] This argument cannot hold good, as the phrase "therefore also" (the same Greek word is used for "and" and "also") is often used in the New Testament without any such force. The word "holy" is probably a predicate, rather than a qualifying adjective; the R.V. has "that which is to be born shall be called holy," putting our A.V. rendering in the margin.

[2] Lat. "Legitimus," "in the proper sense" (Fausset); not an "adopted son," as some heretics taught, saying that the man named Jesus, by virtue of His holy life, received at His Baptism the power of Godhead (but not of course the essence), and became the adopted Son of God. Nov.'s language must not be taken to mean that a certain human body was appropriated by the Son of God. He uses the concrete "son of man" for the abstract "sonship of man."

[3] Or, "certifies Him, and makes Him that which He was not by nature, the Son of God."

[4] The words for "of primary" and "of secondary application" are legal terms. 'Nov. can hardly have written the words as they stand" (Fausset), but it is difficult to emend the passage, and the drift of it is fairly clear.

and came to us, by virtue of the Spirit; the secondary to the man, by virtue of His being the Son of God. From this it naturally follows, that the man became the Son of God, while He is not primarily the Son of God. This is why the angel, aware of the dispensation [1] of God, in explaining this mysterious scheme,[2] did not bring such confusion into the whole plan, as to leave no trace of distinction between the two natures. He did establish such a distinction, by his expression, "Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." If he had not allotted that partition of natures with its due balance, but had left it in hazy confusion, he would really have given the heretics ground for declaring that the Son of man, as man, combines in His Own Person both Son of God and Son of man. As a matter of fact, he distinguished part from part, taking such care to make perfectly clear the scheme and the meaning of the great mystery, as to say, "Also the holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," in proof that the Son of God descended to earth, and by taking upon Him the Son of man, made him by consequence the Son of God. For the Son of God associated and joined with Himself the Son of man, so that the Son of man, being attached by the virtue of His birth to the Son of God, possessed through the very fact of the union, as borrowed [3] and on loan, that which by His Own nature He could not have. Thus the words of the angel made a distinction, unacceptable to the heretics, between the Son of God and

[1] Lat. "dispositio," again for St. Paul's word, "economy."

[2] Lat. "the ordering of that Sacrament."

[3] Not with the implication that the "borrowed" human nature was afterwards restored to its lender, for "The Word *was made* flesh." The point is, that when a thing is borrowed, it passes into the possession of one who did not possess it before. Nov. has to guard himself against "evacuating" the Godhead, while insisting on the Manhood.

the Son of man, yet recognized the proper association of the two, constraining them to understand that the Man Christ, the Son of man, is also the Son of God, and to accept as man the Son of God, that is, the Word of God, Who is, according to the Scriptures, God. So at last they should recognize Christ Jesus the Word as (if I may use the expression) blended and compounded from both, to be both man and God, substance associated with substance in the clasp of a mutual bond, as the truth of Scripture declares.

CHAPTER XXV

CHRIST'S DEATH NO DISPROOF OF HIS GODHEAD

The Argument that "God Died"

VERY well, the heretics say: if Christ is not only man but also God, and Scripture tells us of Christ dead for us and risen again, Scripture teaches us to believe in a God Who died; or if God cannot die, while Christ is said to have died, Christ cannot be God, as we cannot accept as God One Who died. If they ever could understand, or had ever understood, the words that they read, they never could use such dangerous language. But the madness of error always is foolhardy; it is nothing new for men who have abandoned the true and proper faith, to descend to dangerous depths. Here is our answer: if Scripture set before us Christ as God only, with no association with human frailty discoverable in Him, there would naturally have been some force in their perverse syllogism, "if Christ is God, and Christ died, therefore God died."

Christ Died in His Humanity

As we have often pointed out, Scripture lays down that Christ is not only God, but also man. It follows, that we must hold that that nature in Him which is immortal remained uncorrupted by death. Every one can understand, that Divinity is incapable,[1] while human nature is capable, of suffering. Since, then, we understand, that there is in Christ a mutual association and commingling of Deity and humanity (for "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us"), who can fail to grasp by his own common sense, without any teacher or interpreter, that it was not the Deity, but the humanity, that died? Where is the difficulty in allowing that the Divinity in Christ cannot die, but that the substance of flesh alone perishes?

The Soul of Man cannot Die, much less the Word

In the case of ordinary men, who are not flesh only, but flesh and soul, the flesh alone endures the inroads of dissolution and death, while the soul, lying beyond the conditions of dissolution and death, is obviously untouched. This is what Our Lord asserted, when He bade us endure martyrdom, and disregard all the powers of man. "Fear not them," He said, "who kill the the body, but are not able to kill the soul."[2] But if the immortal soul, which is in every man, cannot be killed or slain –although the body and flesh, taken by itself, can be killed—how much more, we may be sure, was it absolutely impossible for the Word of God, Who is God, in Christ, to be killed, when His flesh alone, His body, was killed? If the soul in every man possesses this noble birthright of immortality, so that

[1] "Incorruptible" and "impassible" are here used in their technical theological sense.

[2] Matt. x. 28.

it cannot be killed, much more is it the birthright of the Word of God to possess this power of being unable to be slain. If the power of man is too weak to kill the sacred power[1] of God, and the cruelty of man too weak to kill the soul, much more must it be too weak to kill the Word of God. Why, the soul of man itself was created through the Word of God; if this soul cannot be killed by man, much more, assuredly, the Word of God cannot so perish. And if the utmost barbarity of man towards man can do no more than kill the body, how much more, assuredly, will it be unable to do more than kill the body in the case of Christ? From all these considerations we gather that only the man in Christ was slain; the Word was obviously not brought thereby into subjection to mortality. It is clear that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who beyond question were men, and men only, are alive: "For all" these,[2] saith the Lord, "live unto God," and death, which has brought dissolution to their bodies, cannot destroy their souls. It has been able to exercise its powers against their bodies, but was powerless to do so against their souls; there was in them a mortal element which, being mortal, is dead, and also an immortal element, which, being immortal, we know to be not annihilated. That is why they are authoritatively pronounced to be alive unto God. Much more, assuredly, although death was able to prevail against Christ, so far as His material body was concerned, it could not exercise its powers against the Divinity of the Word. For the power of death is shattered, when the might of immortality intervenes.

[1] The sacred power of life, given by God.

[2] Luke xx. 38. "These" does not appear in our Lord's words. Nov. greatly limits the scope of the saying.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE HERETICAL VIEW THAT CHRIST IS GOD THE FATHER

The Misleading Syllogism

CHRIST is thus proved, on the sacred authority of the Divine Scriptures, to be not man only, but God. This gives other heretics their opportunity; they burst upon us with a scheme by which they propose to shatter the basis of religion in Christ, maintaining that Christ is God the Father, on the very ground that He is declared to be not man only, but is set forth as God also. Their argument is this. We are taught that God is One. Christ is God. Therefore, they argue, the Father and Christ is the One God. Therefore Christ must be called the Father. These men, who do not know Christ, although they allow Him in word the name of God, are obviously in error. They will not have it that He is a second Person[1] after the Father, but that He is the

[1] *Secundam personam.* In the note on "substantia" (p. 40) it was shown why that word was not adopted to express the diversity within the Unity of the Blessed Trinity. In the Greek Testament neither "Trinity" nor "Person" in this sense occurs; and when the question was raised, "Three what?" the Greeks answered, "Three Prosopa." "Prosopon" is used in the Greek Testament for "a face"; it is the Septuagint word for "the Face of God," as a synonym for God Himself. Next it means "a mask," "a character in a play"; hence a "person" as distinct from other "persons" (so also in the Greek Testament). The Latin "persona" also means "a character in a play" (p. 56, note); and it was used in law to express the personality (*e. g.* of a corporation or society) which can possess rights and privileges, and was therefore the natural word for Tertullian to use for the Holy Persons. In this treatise it is used on p. 76 "the order of persons and things," p. 83 "the Person of the Father . . . of Christ," p. 91 "the person who blessed the boys," p. 95 "the Person of Christ," etc. In Greek "Prosopon" passed out of use in favour of "Hypostasis" = "substantia"; in Latin "Persona" persisted.

Father Himself. The reply is easy, and I will briefly give it.

Scripture shows that Christ is the Second Person in the Godhead

Who can fail to see that there is a second Person after the Father, that of the Son, when he reads what was said, in consequence of this relationship, by the Father to the Son, "Let us make man in our image, and in our likeness";[1] and the statement which follows, "And God made man, in the image of God made he him"; or when he holds in his hands the text, "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and sulphur from the Lord out of heaven"?[2] Many similar passages raise the same question.[3] He says to Christ, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee; desire of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession."[4] The beloved writer says, "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool."[5] We open the prophecy of Isaiah, and find the statement, "Thus saith the Lord to Christ my Lord."[6] "I came down from heaven," we read, "not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."[7] We find it written, "For he who sent me is greater than I."[8] We weigh the passage, "I go to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God."[9] We find a text in the same Scriptures, "But it is written

Let it be repeated, that in the Personality of God diversity or inferiority of Person does not mean diversity or inferiority of Essence.

[1] Gen. i. 26. [2] Gen. xix. 24.

[3] Each of these sentences begins with "Or when." Fifteen repetitions of the same rhetorical phrase would hardly be acceptable in English. Many of these passages have been quoted already by Nov.

[4] Ps. ii. 7. [5] Ps. cx. 1. [6] Isa. xlv. 1.

[7] John vi. 38. [8] John xiv. 28. [9] John xx. 17.

in your law, that the testimony of two men is true. I bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me hath borne witness of me."[1] There is the voice which came from heaven, saying. "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again."[2] Peter answered and said, "Thou art the Son of the living God";[3] and the Lord Himself gave His approval to the mystery of this revelation when He said, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Christ Himself utters my next passages: "Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was";[4] and again, "Father, I know that thou hearest me always, but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me."[5] And Christ Himself formulates a rule[6] of faith: "And this is life eternal, that they may know thee the one true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. I have glorified thee on the earth, I have finished the work that thou gavest me."[7] Once more, He asserts and declares, "All things are delivered to me of my Father,"[8] while prophets and apostles alike prove that He "sits on the right hand of the Father."[9] Indeed, I should have a long task enough if I tried to gather together every single passage bearing on the point, seeing that the Divine Scripture of Old and New Testament alike everywhere presents one picture of Christ. He is born of the Father; through Him all things were made, and without Him nothing was made; He has ever been obedient to the Father, and is obedient. He ever has power over all things, but this power is as delivered to Him, as allowed, as granted to Him by His Own Father. What can be so conclusive

[1] John viii. 17, 18. [2] John xii. 28. [3] Matt. xvi. 16.
[4] John xvii. 5. [5] John xi. 42. [6] So on p. 74.
[7] John xvii. 3 [8] Luke x. 22. [9] Ps. cx. 1; Mk. xvi. 19.

a proof that He is not the Father, but the Son, as this, that He is set before us as obedient to God the Father? Otherwise, if we believed Him to be the Father, we should be compelled to say that there was another Father, to whom Christ was in subjection.

CHAPTER XXVII

IN WHAT SENSE CHRIST AND THE FATHER ARE "ONE"

The Conjunction "and" shows a Distinction

THERE is a passage which heretics often press upon us, in which the words occur "I and the Father are one."[1] Here, too, we shall vanquish them as easily as in the last chapter. If Christ had been the Father, as the heretics suppose, He ought to have said, "I the Father am one." On the contrary, he says "I," and then mentions the Father, saying, "I and the Father." Thus He distinguishes and separates the individuality of His Own Person, as the Son, from the majesty of the Father; not only as a matter of a name, but with regard to the order of power in the Divine dispensation.[2] He could perfectly well have said "I the Father," if He had had it in His mind that He was the Father.

The Word "One" is in the Neuter Gender

Heretics should note, too, that He said "one" in the neuter, not in the masculine; because "one," in the neuter gender, expresses a harmony of fellowship, not a unity of Person. The neuter rather than the masculine is used because there is no reference to number, but an assertion of the close association of the one with the other.

[1] John x. 30. [2] Again, "economy."

Our Lord does not say "I am," but "We are," One

And once more, He proceeds to say "We are," not "I am," making it clear by the phrase, "I and the Father are one," that the Persons are two, and that the use of the neuter "one" points to the harmony,[1] the identity of thought, the association of affection, existing between them; so that the Father and the Son are naturally one through harmony, through love, and through attachment. He is Son, because He is of the Father, with all that such relationship implies; yet there is an abiding distinction between the Two, so that He is not Father Who is Son, because He is not Son Who is Father. He would not have used the plural "We are" if He had had it in His mind that He, the One and only Father, had been made the Son.

Two Men can be said to be "One," though Different Persons

And, in fact, the Apostle Paul recognizes this unity based on harmony, yet admitting a distinction of persons. In writing to the Corinthians he says, "I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase. Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one"[2] (*in the neuter*). Who can fail to see that Apollos is one person, Paul another; that one and the same person is not equally Paul and Apollos? In fact, he makes a clear distinction between the respective services of the two; "he who plants" is one person, "he who waters" is another. Yet the apostle declares that these two persons

[1] This interpretation, with the illustration which follows, is far from expressing the Unity of Essence existing in the Godhead. Nov. cannot have thought that this was all that the words imply.

[2] 1 Cor. iii. 6.

are "one," in the neuter, not in the masculine, to show that Apollos is one person, Paul another, so far as the distinction of persons is concerned, but that the two are "one" (*in the neuter*) with regard to the harmony existing between them. For where between two persons there is a unity of thought, a unity of truth, a unity of faith, a unity and identity of religion, a unity in the fear of God, the two are one, for all their being two. They are the same thing, because they are of the same mind. For those whom the principle of personality divides, the principle of religion brings together again. And although they are not one and the same persons, yet so long as they are of the same mind they are the same thing; and though they are two persons, yet they are one, provided they have fellowship in the faith, in spite of their differentiation in personality.

The Father and the Son are Different Persons, yet One

And, in fact, the Lord laid down a distinction between Himself and the Father in His answer to the Jews. They were so much disturbed and enraged, in their ignorance, by His words, that they even took up stones to cast at Him, rushing upon Him and saying, "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."[1] He stated the principle upon which He had said, or wished it to be understood, that He was God. "Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified,[2] and sent into this world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?" Here again He said that He had a Father. Clearly He is the Son, not the Father; He would have acknowledged Himself to be the Father if

[1] John x. 33.
[2] The word used in O.T. for the "ordination" for their work of Hebrew priests, or of the "kingdom of priests."

He had had it in mind that He was the Father. Moreover, He declares that He has been sanctified by His Father. As He receives sanctification from the Father, it follows that He is not the Father, but the Son. For if He had been the Father He would have given, not received, sanctification. On the contrary, He maintains that He has received sanctification from the Father, and the proof which he gives by this receiving of sanctification that He is less than the Father, demonstrates that He is the Son, not the Father. Further, He asserts that He has been sent by the Father. So the Lord Christ came, because He was sent, in obedience; a proof that He is not the Father, but the Son, Who certainly would have been the sender, not the sent, had He been the Father. But it was not the Father Who was sent; had it been so, His being sent would prove that the Father was in subjection to another God. As if this was not enough He added a last word, to banish all obscurity, and put an end to the whole controversy of error. "Say ye, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?" Seeing, then, that the Lord clearly testifies that He is the Son, not the Father, it is a matter of great rashness, and extraordinary madness, to carry on a controversy about the Divine Nature and about religion in the face of the testimony of the Lord Christ Himself, and to say that Christ Jesus is the Father, when one notes that He has proved that He is not the Father, but the Son.

CHAPTER XXVIII

SEEING THE FATHER IN CHRIST

The Heretical Argument based on Our Lord's Words to Philip

I MUST pass on to another point upon which the heretic, though he rejoices, so to speak, in a special eye of his own (but he has lost the eye of truth and light!) must acknowledge the total[1] blindness of his error. Over and over again he brings against us the words, "Have I been so long with you, and yet do ye not know me? Philip, he who hath seen me, hath seen also the Father."[2] I must explain to the heretic what he does not understand.

To know Christ is to know the Father

Philip is blamed, and rightly and deservedly blamed, for saying, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." For when had he heard from Christ, or been taught, any suggestion that Christ is the Father? On the contrary, he had often heard, and often been taught, that He was the Son, not that He was the Father. True, the Lord said, "If ye knew me, ye would know my Father also; and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him." But this was because He wished it to be understood not that He was the Father, but that he who from his heart, perfectly, and with full faith and devotion, has come to the Son of God, shall certainly attain through the Son in Whom he has so believed, to the Father, and shall see Him. "For no man cometh unto the Father," he saith, "except through me." And hereby not only shall he in the future come to God the

[1] This and the last passage considered are like the heretic's two eyes, one of which Nov. has already put out.

[2] John xiv. 9.

Father, and know the Father Himself; he can claim to have possession of Him, and to enjoy in anticipation the fruition of Him in spirit and mind, as if he already knew the Father, as he knows the Son, and saw Him.

The "Prophetic Present" of Holy Scripture

For the Divine Scripture often speaks of things which have not yet been done as already done, because they are so going to be done in the future, and records things which are certainly to happen, as though they had already happened, instead of foretelling them as in the future. On this principle the prophet Isaiah says, "For unto us a child is born,"[1] although in his time Christ had not yet been born. "And I approached unto the prophetess, and she conceived, and bare a son,"[2] although the visitation of Mary had not yet taken place. Christ had not yet revealed *the purpose hidden in* the bosom of the Father, when he said, "And his name is called the angel of great counsel."[3] He had not suffered yet, but "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter."[4] As yet there was no Cross, but he said, "All the day long have I stretched forth my hands unto an unbelieving people."[5] Though Christ had not yet been given the cup of scorn to drink, "When I was thirsty," he says, "they gave me vinegar to drink";[6] though He had not yet been stripped, he declared, "Upon my vesture did they cast lots; and they numbered my bones, they pierced my hands and feet."[7] In all such passages the Divine Scripture anticipates, speaking of things which it knows will come to pass as done, and of future events which it records, which undoubtedly shall happen, as fully accomplished. In this sense the Lord said, in the

[1] Isa. ix. 6.
[2] Isa. viii. 3.
[3] Isa. ix. 6.
[4] Isa. liii. 7.
[5] Isa. lxv. 2.
[6] Ps. lxix. 21.
[7] Ps. xxii. 16 ff.

passage before us, "From henceforth we know him, and have seen him." He said that the Father would be seen by every one whosoever, who should have followed the Son; not meaning that the Son was the Father Himself, now seen, but that every man who should be willing to follow Him and to be His disciple, should win the reward of being able to see the Father. For as He is the Image of the Father, this further truth bears upon our question: that as the Father works, so does the Son also, and the Son does the like[1] to all His Father's works. Thus each man, when he sees Him Who in all His works ever does the like[1] to the invisible Father, may account it to be the same thing, as if he already saw the Father.

Other Passages distinguish the Son from the Father

Again, if Christ is the Father Himself, how is it that He at once continues, "He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater things than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father?" The words immediately following are connected with these: "If ye love me, keep my commandments; and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter;" and again, "If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." Once more, "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." After this definite statement that He is the Son, He naturally continues, a little lower down, "If ye loved me ye would rejoice, because I go to the Father; for the Father is greater than I." This is in close connection with the words below: "I am the true vine,

[1] Lat. "is the imitator of."

and my Father is the husbandman; every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh it away; and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit."[1] Still He presses on, adding, "As the Father hath loved me, so I have loved you: continue ye in my love; if ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love."[2] Still heaping phrase upon phrase, He says, "I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." And he adds to the mountain of evidence, "But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me."

By seeing the Son, the Image of God, we learn to see God the Father

Surely the Lord would never have used one expression after another, all bearing witness that He is not the Father but the Son, if He had had it in His mind that He was the Father, or wished Himself to be understood to be the Father. There is only one explanation of His action. He wished to express, that every man should account it to be the same thing to see the Image of God the Father through the Son, as to have seen the Father; inasmuch as every man who believes in the Son is trained, through the contemplation of the Image, to grow accustomed to see the Godhead in the Image, and so to advance and progress, even to the perfect contemplation of God the Father Almighty. Further, that he who has assimilated this truth with his whole heart and mind, and has believed that it shall be as He said, has already in a certain sense seen the Father Whom he shall see hereafter, and already, here upon

[1] John xv. 1. [2] Ibid. 10.

earth, is possessed, as if he had it in his grasp, of that which he is assured he shall possess in the future.

The Promise to the Pure in Heart is for the Future

Once again, if He had been the Father Himself, why did He continually promise as a future reward a blessing which He had already bestowed and given? When He says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,"[1] He is obviously promising the contemplation and vision of the Father. He had not then yet given it; for why should He promise it, if He had already given it? He had given it, if He was the Father; for He was seen, and touched. At the very time that Christ is being seen and touched, He yet promises that he who shall have been of a pure heart shall see the Father, thus proving that He is not the Father. He Who was making this promise, then, was not the Father, but the Son; Who as the Son was promising what should afterwards be seen. His promise would have been meaningless had He been other than the Son. Why did He keep promising to the pure in heart that they should see the Father, if those who were present when He spoke, already saw the Father, meaning Christ? Nay, because He was the Son, not the Father, and because the Son, as the Image of the Father was actually being seen at the time, the promise is given that the Father also, as He is invisible to the physical eye, shall be seen by the pure in heart. And so it is set down in Holy Scripture.

An Apology for Brevity

I must be content with what I have urged in answer even to so dangerous a heretic, little though it be upon a wide subject. For a plain, yes, a broad and spacious plain, will open before us, if we wish to hunt him more

[1] Matt. v. 8.

completely; seeing that now he is deprived of the use of those two passages he is like a man who has lost his eyes, and is utterly overcome in the blindness of his doctrine.

PART III—OF GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT

CHAPTER XXIX

THE UNITY AND THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The Holy Spirit is One, though His Works are Manifold

NEXT, the order of our subject and the authority of the faith, for a proper statement of the words of the Lord spoken and written, bid us believe also in the Holy Spirit, Who was long ago promised to the Church,[1] and duly bestowed on the occasions appointed in time. The promise was given through the prophet Joel; the fulfilment of the promise through Christ. The prophet says, "In the last days I will pour out of my spirit upon my servants and handmaidens";[2] the Lord said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye shall remit, they shall be remitted; and whose ye retain they shall be retained."[3] The Holy Spirit the Lord sometimes calls the Paraclete,[4] sometimes He declares that He is the Spirit of truth. He is not a new power in the

[1] "Promised to the Church" was possibly included in the form of the creed used by Nov.

[2] Joel ii. 29.

[3] John xx. 22.

[4] In Greek, "spirit" is a neuter word; possibly therefore impersonal. "Paraclete" or "advocate" is masculine, and obviously personal. Christ the speaker was our Advocate, and promises "another Advocate" to carry on His work. Hence Nov.'s introduction of this title in particular.

Gospel, nor even is the manner of His bestowal new. It was He Who in the prophets arraigned the people of the Jews, and in the apostles granted their call to the Gentiles.[1] The Jews deserved the arraignment, for their contempt of the law; and those who believe from among the Gentiles deserve the protecting aid of the Spirit, for their eagerness to attain to the law of the Gospel. Different kinds of functions of course exist in Him, since different times give rise to different kinds of circumstances; yet this does not make Him Who works in different ways divergent in Himself, nor is He another Person when He so acts, but ever one and the same, apportioning His functions as the times, the conditions, and the requirements of the situation demand. In fact, the Apostle Paul says, "We having the same spirit, according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak."[2] So it is one and the same Spirit, Who is in the prophets and in the apostles; only that He is in the prophets to meet a particular situation, in the apostles at all times. In other words, He is in the one, not so as to be in them always, in the other, so as to abide in them always; in the one, as doled out in moderation, in the other as poured forth in His entirety; in the one, as sparingly given, in the other, as generously granted, and yet not granted before the resurrection of the Lord, but bestowed through the resurrection of Christ. For He said,[3] "I will pray the Father, and He will give you another advocate, that He may be with you for ever, the

[1] Nov. does not aim at giving an exhaustive account of the Holy Spirit. Serious heresies as to His Person and work had not yet arisen; he only has in mind those who said that the God of the Old Testament was not the God of the New. On the contrary, the promises and warnings of the Old Testament, and their fulfilment in the New, are perfectly consistent.

[2] 2 Cor. iv. 13.

[3] John xiv. 16, 17; xv. 26; xvi. 7, 13.

spirit of truth"; and "when that advocate shall come, whom I shall send unto you from the Father, the spirit of truth, who proceeded from my Father"; and "If I go not away, that advocate will not come to you; but if I go away, I will send him to you"; and "when the spirit of truth shall come, he will guide you to all truth." And as the Lord was presently to go away into heaven, He could not but give the Paraclete to His disciples, or He would most unaccountably have left them in the position of wards,[1] and forsaken them without any to be their advocate and guardian.

The Gifts of the Spirit to the Bride of Christ

For it is He Who strengthened their souls and minds, Who clearly brought out for them the mysteries of the gospel, Who threw light within them upon divine things, by Whom they were made strong to fear neither bonds nor imprisonment for the name of the Lord; nay, more, they trampled under foot the very powers and the torments of the world, only because they were ready armed and fortified through Him, since they possessed within themselves the gifts which this same Spirit distributes and assigns, like ornaments, to the Church, the Bride of Christ. He it is Who appoints the prophets in the Church, instructs the teachers, distributes the tongues, performs acts of power and of healing, works miracles, bestows the discernings of spirits, assigns governments, suggests counsels, and sets in their right places and due order all other gifts of grace.[2] Thus does He make the Church of the Lord perfect and complete, in all places and in all things.

[1] Lat. "pupillus;" "guardian" is "tutor;" both legal terms. Our Lord's word (A.V. "comfortless") is "orphans."

[2] Nov. uses St. Paul's Greek word from 1 Cor. xii. 4, etc. (A.V. "gifts": Vulgate Latin, "gratiæ").

The Gift of the Spirit to Christ at His Baptism, as foretold

He it is Who, when the Lord had been baptized, came upon Him [1] in the manner of a dove, and abode upon Him. In Christ alone He dwelt fully and entirely, not crippled in any measure or portion, but in all His overflowing abundance dispensed and sent forth, so that the rest of mankind ca njoy what I will call a first sip of grace, issuing from Christ. For the source of the Holy Spirit in the entirety of His Being ever remains in Christ, in order that from Him might issue streams of gifts and of works, because the Holy Spirit dwells in Him in rich affluence. This is what Isaiah said in his prophecy [2]: "And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and piety, and the spirit of the fear of the Lord shall fill him" He repeated the very same thing in another passage, speaking in the name [3] of the Lord Himself: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me; because he has anointed me to preach good tidings unto the poor hath he sent me." [4] In the same way, David says: "Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." [5] The Apostle Paul is speaking of this when he says: "For he who hath not the spirit of Christ, he is not his," [6] and "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." [7]

[1] Some heretics taught that Christ was made the Son of God at His Baptism. The "beginning of miracles" which followed it was due to His reception of the Holy Spirit.
[2] Isa. xi. 2.
[3] Latin "from the person," as on p. 56.
[4] Isa. lxi. 1.
[5] Ps. xlv. 7.
[6] Rom. viii. 9.
[7] 2 Cor. iii 17.

The New Birth in Baptism

He it is Who brings about the second birth, from water.[1] Thus He is, as it were, the seed of a divine generation, the consecrator of a heavenly birth, the pledge of the promised inheritance, the written bond, so to speak, of eternal salvation, to make us the temple of God, and perfect us as His home. He appeals to the divine ears on our behalf, with groanings which cannot be uttered, thus performing His functions as our advocate, and discharging the duties of His office as our defender. He is given us to dwell in our bodies, and to bring about our sanctification; to advance our bodies, by this operation of His, to eternal life and to the resurrection of immortality, while He accustoms them in Himself to be mingled with heavenly powers, and to be associated with the divine eternity of the Holy Spirit. For in Him, and through Him, our bodies are instructed to progress to immortality, through learning the discipline of temperance in accordance with His decrees. For it is He who "lusteth against the flesh," because "the flesh is contrary to him"[2]; it is He Who restrains insatiable lusts, breaks unbridled desires, quenches unlawful passions; Who overcomes fiery assaults, hurls back the hordes of drunkenness, drives off the hosts of avarice, turns to flight the armies of debauch; Who joins men together in love, and knits them together in affection; Who drives off sects, explains

[1] There is no mention of Confirmation, probably because in early times "Baptism by water and the laying on of hands" was one ceremony, the two things not being dissociated as they are with us. At the same time, Nov.'s enemies accused him of having never been confirmed (he was baptized on his sick-bed); but he would hardly have been admitted to Holy Orders if this had been true.

[2] Gal. v. 17.

the rule of truth, vanquishes heretics, casts forth the wicked beyond the doors, and guards the gospels.[1]

The Work of the Spirit in the Church

Of Him the same apostle writes: "For we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God."[2] Of Him he boasts, when he says: "But I think that I also have the spirit of God."[3] Of Him he says: "And the spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets."[4] Of Him he declares: "Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared."[5] Established in this Spirit, "No man" ever "calleth Jesus accursed"[6]; no man has denied Christ as the Son of God, or rejected God as the Creator; no man brings forward any words of his own, contrary to the Scriptures; no man lays down alien and impious decrees; no man draws up strange laws. The blasphemer against Him, whosoever he be, "hath not forgiveness, not only in this world, but also in the world to come."[7] He gives in apostles due witness to Christ, shows in martyrs the unyielding faith of religion, locks in the breast of virgins the marvellous continence of sealed chastity, guards in the rest of mankind the laws of the Lord's doctrine, uncorrupted and untainted; He destroys heretics, corrects the wayward, convinces unbelievers, reveals impostors, and corrects the wicked; He keeps the Church uncorrupted and inviolate in the sanctity of perpetual virginity and truth.

[1] "The Church is witness and keeper of Holy Writ" (Article XX.), through the Spirit Who is said in the last sentence of this chapter to keep the Church in the sanctity of perpetual virginity and truth.

[2] 1 Cor. ii. 12. [3] 1 Cor. vii. 40. [4] 1 Cor. xiv. 32.
[5] 1 Tim. iv. 1. [6] 1 Cor. xii. 3. [7] Matt. xii. 32.

PART IV—OF THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD

CHAPTER XXX

THE GODHEAD OF CHRIST DOES NOT IMPAIR THE UNITY OF THE GODHEAD

My readers must take what I have said upon the subject of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as a brief statement, designedly concise, and not drawn out in a lengthy argument. It could have been drawn out more fully, and extended with more weighty argument, seeing that the whole of the Old and of the New Testaments could be marshalled in witness that the true faith is what I have said. But heretics are continually struggling against the truth, and have a standing quarrel with the genuine tradition and the catholic faith; they are offended at Christ, because He is declared by the Scriptures to be God, as well as man, and is believed by us to be so. Therefore, that our faith may be vindicated from all heretical slander, it is right that we should discuss the Godhead of Christ in such a way as to show that it interferes neither with the truth of Scripture, nor with our faith;[1] inasmuch as the unity of God is asserted through the Scriptures, and no less definitely held and believed by us.

The Two Heretical Syllogisms, like the Two Thieves

Some heretics, as we know, say that Jesus Christ is Himself God the Father, others insist that He is only

[1] The two standards of appeal: Church tradition and Holy Scripture.

man. Both alike have seized upon the same grounds and reasons for their error and obstinacy. Noticing that it is written that God is One, they have supposed that they could not hold that opinion, unless they supposed it to be a matter of faith, either that Christ was only man, or failing that, that He was God the Father. In their efforts to discredit Him, they continually try to recommend their peculiar error by the following syllogisms. Those who say that Jesus Christ is the Father, argue that if God is One, and Christ is God, then Christ is the Father, because God is One. If Christ is not the Father, while Christ, the Son, is God also, it must appear that two gods have been introduced, contrary to the Scriptures. On the other hand, those who insist that Christ is only a man, draw up their syllogism from the opposite point of view, in this way: If God is one Person, the Son another, while the Father is God, and Christ also is God, then God is not one, but again two gods are introduced—the Father and the Son; and if God be one, it follows that Christ must be a man, that the Father may really be one God. In very truth we may say that the Lord is being crucified between two thieves, as He was once literally crucified; and so He is exposed on either side to the impious railings of these heretics.

The Scriptures affirm both the Unity of God and the Godhead of Christ

Neither in the Holy Scriptures, nor in ourselves, can they find any excuses for their self-destruction and blindness, if there are things plainly set forth as embedded in the divine writings, which they are either unwilling, or unable, to see. For we know, and read, and believe, and hold, that God is One, Who made the heavens and the earth alike. We know none other, nor

can we ever know; for there is none other. "I," he saith, "am God; and there is none beside me; a just God and a Saviour."[1] And in another place: "I am the first and the last, and beside me there is no God. Who is as I am?"[2] Again: "Who hath meted out heaven with the span, and the earth with his hand? Who hath weighed the mountains in the scale, and the woods in a balance?"[3] And Hezekiah writes: "That all men may know that thou are God alone."[4] Once more, the Lord Himself says: "Why askest thou me of the good? The one God is good."[5] So, too, the Apostle Paul: "Who alone hath immortality, and dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see"[6]; and in another place: "A mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one."[7] But while we hold, and read, and believe this truth, we are equally bound not to pass by a single passage of the heavenly Scriptures. We may not in any way reject the marks of Christ's Divinity which are set forth in the Scriptures. Otherwise, we may lay ourselves open to the charge of having violated the soundness of our holy faith, by violating the authority of Scripture. Let us see, then, that we believe this truth as well as the other, for it is a most faithful saying that Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is the Son of God: inasmuch as "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us"[8]: and, "My Lord and my God."[9] And "whose are the fathers, and of whom Christ came according to the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for evermore."[10]

[1] Isa. xlv. 21 (LXX.). [2] Isa. xliv. 6, 7. [3] Isa. xl. 12.
[4] 2 Kings xix. 19. [5] Matt. xix. 17. [6] 1 Tim. vi. 16.
[7] Gal. iii. 20. [8] John i. 1, 14. [9] John xx. 28.
[10] Rom. ix. 5.

Scripture apparently asserts in other Cases both Unity and Plurality

What shall we say, then? Does Scripture set before us two Gods? Surely not. If so, how does it say that "God is one"? Or on the other hand, is Christ also not God? Surely not. If so, how was it said to Christ, "My Lord and my God"? Unless, then, we hold this whole truth with due reverence and sound argument, we shall deservedly be held to have supplied the heretics with an occasion of stumbling. This will certainly not be from any fault in the heavenly Scriptures, which never deceive, but from human error and presumption, through which they have wilfully become heretics. First of all, we must turn back upon themselves the serpent-like argument of those controversialists, who presume to make out that there must be two Gods.

It is written, and they cannot deny it, that "the Lord is one." Now what think they of Christ? That He is Lord, or that He is not Lord at all? Nay, they have no doubt at all that He is Lord. If, then, their reasoning is sound, the conclusion is that there are two Lords. How, then, is there still, according to the Scriptures, but one Lord? Again, Christ is called "the one Master";[1] and yet we read, that the Apostle Paul is also a master.[2] Then there is not a one master; for according to our premisses there are two. How, then, is there, according to the Scriptures, one Master, Christ? "One" is said in the Scriptures to be "good, that is, God."[3] Yet in the same Scriptures, Christ is set forth as good. Here, again, then, if their deduction is correct, there is not one,

[1] Matt. xxiii. 8.

[2] 2 Tim. i. 11. But Paul is not "master" (or "teacher," Lat. *magister*) in the same sense as Christ. Nov. does not make clear that Christ is God in the same sense that the Father is God, with a difference of Person, or order, but not of Essence, through the perfection of the Divine Personality.

[3] Matt. xix. 17.

but two who are good. How, then, is it stated, according to the faith expressed in the Scriptures, that there is one Good? Well, here are three statements: that there is one Lord, that there is one Master, that there is one Good. If they do not consider that any objection can be raised to these, on the grounds that Christ also is Lord, that Paul also is master, that Christ also is called Good; by the same process of reasoning they must understand that no objection on the ground that God is one, can be raised to the statement that Christ also is declared to be God.

CHAPTER XXXI

CONCLUSION

The Eternal Relationship of the Son to the Father

THERE is, then, God the Father, Who established and created all things, Who alone is without origin, invisible, boundless, immortal, eternal, the One God. To His greatness, His majesty, His powers alike, nothing whatever can be placed, I will not say in superiority, but even in comparison. From Him, at such a time as He, the Father, willed,[1] the Word, Who is the Son, was born; the Word, understood not in the sense of a sound striking upon the air, or the resonance of the voice forced from the lungs, but acknowledged as the Personal

[1] Nov. seems to contradict himself, speaking of a time "when" the Father willed, though God is "timeless" (p. 26), so that this "time" was "before all time." Christ is the "I am," Who was "in the beginning with God"; yet He is "of God," and "came forth from the Father." Later theologians spoke of "the eternal generation of the Son"; in Nov.'s time no language had been found by which to reconcile the antithesis. "Eternity" is not the equivalent of "all time," but of "life," which is timeless.

Substance[1] of a power issuing forth from God. As to the secrets of this sacred and divine nativity, no apostle has taught them, no prophet has discovered them, no angel has ascertained them, no creature has known them; they are known to the Son alone, Who has knowledge of the secret things of the Father.

The Son has His Origin in the Father, Who has no Origin

The Son, then, since He is begotten of the Father, is always in the Father. When I say "always," I do not maintain that He is unborn, but that He is born. Yet He Who is before all time, must be said to have always existed in the Father; for a date in time cannot be fixed for Him Who is before all time. He is eternally in the Father; otherwise the Father were not always Father. At the same time, the Father is antecedent to Him, for the Father must of necessity be before the Son, as Father, inasmuch as He Who knows not an origin must of necessity exist before Him Who has an origin. Of necessity, too, the Son must be less than the Father, for He knows Himself to be in the Father; He has an origin, in that He is born, and through the Father, in some mysterious manner, although He has an origin, as born, He is germane[2] to Him, in the matter of His

[1] In this chapter the word "substance" is used in a slightly different sense (see in next paragraph, "the divine personal substance, Whose name is the Word"), to represent the etymologically identical Greek word for "person." It is not so much the Essential Being, as the Personality of that Being, that is now emphasized.

[2] Lat. "vicinus," "near to," "like." Although we have to use such expressions as "born of the Father," "after the Father," yet in a manner beyond our understandings, He is of the same nature as the Father in being eternal, without a beginning. The nature of Ultimate Reality is beyond us. To us, human personality, as we know it, is the highest form of existence; but Personality as we know it does not exhaust the Divine Nature. We can understand, though we cannot conceive, something which we may call super-personality in the Being of God, so that He Who has His origin in the Father can yet be germane to Him in having no beginning. "He hath given to the Son to have life in himself."

birth, seeing that He is born of the Father, Who alone has no origin. He, then, at such time as the Father willed, proceeded from the Father; and He Who was in the Father, because He was of the Father, was thereafter with the Father, because He proceeded from the Father, being none other than the Divine Personal Substance, Whose name is the Word, through Whom all things were made, and without Whom nothing was made. For all things are after Him, since they are through Him, and of course He is before all things (but after the Father), seeing that all things were made through Him. He proceeded from the Father, at Whose will all things were made, God, assuredly, proceeding from God, constituting the Second Person after the Father, as Son, yet not robbing the Father of the unity of the Godhead.

As the Son is born of the Father, there cannot be two Gods

For, if He had not been born, as unborn He would have been brought into comparison with Him Who is unborn; then Both would have been shown to be on the same level, and so He would make two Unborn, and therefore, two Gods. If He had not been begotten, He would have been ranked with Him Who is not begotten, and the Two, being found to be equal, as unbegotten, would, of course, have given us two Gods, and so Christ would have given us two Gods. If He were like the Father, without an origin, He, too, would prove to be like the Father, the beginning of all things, making two beginnings; with the result that He would have set before us two Gods, as well as two beginnings. Again, if He were not the Son, but the Father, begetting another son from Himself, of course He would have been ranked with the Father, and been declared to be as great as He; then He would have constituted two Fathers, and so would have justified also the idea of two

Gods. If He had been invisible, He would have ranked with Him who is invisible, and been declared equal to Him ; then He would have set before us two Invisibles, and so have admitted that there are also two Gods. If He had been incomprehensible,[1] if He had possessed all the other attributes of the Father,[2] I will go so far as to say that He would have given fair grounds for the theory of two Gods devised by this party in the controversy. But as the matter stands, whatever He is, He is not of Himself ; for He is not unborn, but of the Father. He is begotten. For whether He is the Word, whether He is power, whether He is wisdom, whether He is light, whether He is the Son—whatever He is of these, He has no other source of His Being, as we have said before, than the Father. He owes His origin to the Father. He could not then occasion any variance in the Divine Essence, by making two Gods ; for He derived His origin, in being born, from Him Who is the one God. In dealing with this subject, inasmuch as He is the only begotten and the first begotten, of Him, Who, as having no origin, is alone the beginning and the fountain-head of all things, He thereby declared that God is One ; Whom He has evinced to be not in subjection to any beginning or source of being, but rather Himself the source of being, and the beginning of all things.

His Obedience proves His Sonship

It is accordingly, part of the same truth, that He does nothing of His Own will, and makes nothing of His Own counsel, and comes not from Himself, but obeys every

[1] As we saw in Chap. II., "incomprehensible" in the "Athanasian Creed" is the rendering of *immensus*, "boundless," "not confined in space." Here the Latin is *incomprehensibilis*, "not to be grasped by the mind."

[2] If he had possessed them by His Own right, not as a gift.

command and injunction of the Father. His birth proves Him to be the Son, yet His devoted obedience declares that He is the minister of the will of the Father, from Whom He has His Being. And so, while He renders due submission to the Father in all things, though He is God as well as minister, yet by His obedience He shows that the Father, from Whom He drew His origin, is One God.

The Birth of the Son from the Father proves the Unity of God

Thus it was impossible for Him to make two Gods, as He did not make two origins, He Who before all time received the beginning of birth from Him Who has no origin. That Which is unborn is the source of being to all else; this Unborn is the One God the Father, Himself beyond origin, from Whom is He Who is born. Now as He Who is born of Him, of course, comes from Him Who has no origin, thus proving that the source of being is He of Whom He Himself is, though He Who has been born is God, yet He declares that God is One, since He Who has been born has established that He is without origin.

The Community of the Divine Substance

God, then, He is, but God begotten unto Godhead. Lord, too, He is, but born of the Father unto Lordship. Angel, too, He is, but Angel sent forth from His Father, to declare the great counsel of God. His Divinity is so transmitted to Him, that He cannot appear to have given us two Gods, either through discord, or through inequality,[1] within the Godhead. The subjection of all things to Him, as Son, by the Father, and the subjection

[1] The Godhead of the One is not a different Godhead from that of the Other, but wholly derived from that Other, and absolutely the same thing.

of Himself, together with everything that has been put in subjection to Him, to His Father, prove that He is the Son of His Father; as to all else, we find Him to be both their Lord and their God. Hence all things are placed under His feet, and delivered to Him who is God, and the Son acknowledges that all things are in subjection to Him as a gift from the Father; thus He refers back to the Father the entire authority of Godhead. The Father is shown to be the One God, true and eternal; from Him alone this power of Divinity issues, and though it is transmitted to the Son and centred upon Him, it runs its course back to the Father, through their community of Substance. The Son is shown to be God, since Divinity is manifestly delivered and granted to Him; yet none the less, the Father is proved to be the One God, while step by step that same Majesty and Divinity, like a billow [1] returning upon itself, sent forth again from the Son Himself, returns and finds its way back to the Father Who gave it. Thus we see that the Father is the God of all things, and also the source of the being of His Son, Whom He has begotten as Lord; and the Son is the God of all else, since the Father has appointed Him Whom He begat to be over all things.

Briefly, then, our conclusion is this: [2] "The Mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus," [3] Who possesses power over the whole creation, which is put in subjection

[1] This is a thought of Nov.'s own. Fausset considers that the "reciprocal flowing" is a metaphor derived from the movements of the heavenly bodies. The word is ordinarily used of a stream; but streams do not "flow back" upon themselves.

[2] The whole chapter bears signs of alterations; the last few pages of a book often get torn, and missing portions have to be replaced as well as may be. The last sentence is well-nigh hopeless. "A stylist like Nov. could hardly have brought this treatise to a close with such a lame peroration," and it is doubtful whether he accepted the Epistle to the Hebrews as canonical. We cannot tell what he actually wrote.

[3] 1 Tim. ii. 5.

to Him as God by His Own Father, together with the whole creation so put in subjection to Him, found at last to be in perfect harmony with His Father, God, while yet it is eternally true that "he was heard,"[1] has proved that there is one true God, and one alone, His Father.

[1] Heb. v. 7.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Abraham, 70, 76, 83 f., 111
Accommodation in Scripture, 37
Adam, 64, 76, 80
Adopted Son, 107
Advocate, 124, 128
Aeons, 13
Africa, 59
African Church, 9
"Also," 107
Angel of Great Counsel, 82 ff., 120
Angels, 24, 42, 45, 53, 77, 79, 80, 92, 99, 106, 108, 135, 138
Anger, 36
Antecedent (the Father), 135
Anthropomorphic language, 37
Anticipations, in Scripture, 120
Apelles, 50
"Appearance, in," 50
Artificer, 13, 22, 25, 29 ff., 45
Ascension, 55, 66, 80
Association, 115
Assumption, 96, 101, 104
Augustine, 16, 26

Babel, 79
Baptism, 12, 30, 52, 128
Begotten, 53
Bethel, 88
Bethlehem, 59
Birth of Christ, 67, 100, 104, 107, 108
—— —— (eternal), 134, 138
——, second, 128
Birthright, 110
Blasphemy, 71, 93, 117, 129
Body of Christ, 50, 52, 106
—— of man, 36, 39, 49, 51, 111
Bosom, 86, 120
Bride (Church), 126; (flesh), 61

Canon, 12, 21
Cathari, 9
Catholic faith, 130
Change, sign of mortality, 32
Changelessness, 32
Chariot of God, 44
Cherubim, 44
Christ is God, as Son, 46, 54, 58 ff., 72, 132 ff.; is the Word, 51 f., 60, 64, 66, 69, 77 f., 96, 98, 101, 104, 107, 110, 134; not the Father, 58 f., 72, 102, 112 ff., 118, 122, 130; God and man, 59, 63, 68, 96, 112; Second Person after the Father, 112, 136; One with the F., 115; proceeded from God, 69; "after the F.," 135; Divine Personal Substance, 135; germane to the F., 135; pre-existent, 65, 75, 96, 135; from heaven, 66 ff., 79, 108; omnipresent, 65; all made through Him, 63, 65, 78; Mediator, 65, 104, 139; pardons sins, 24; brings us to knowledge of God, 43; Majesty, 53; is with us, 57; hope in Him, 65; invoked, 65, 88; gives immortality, 69 f., 72; before Abraham, 70; sends Paraclete, 73; couples Himself with God, 73; King, 60; Judge, 55; declares purpose of the F., 86, 120; all subject to Him, 92, 138; first-born, 96; grace through Him, 127; begotten, 100, 135 ff.; born, 134
Son of Man, 62, 95, 105,

107 f.; very man, 53; obedient, 102, 114, 118, 137; emptied Himself, 101; put on and put off flesh, 97; has an origin, 135; subject to the F., 139; receives human nature on loan, 108; imitator of God, 95, 99, 121; Angel of Great Counsel, 82 ff.; not angel only, 83 ff.; had a true body, 52; suffered, 53; overcome by Jews, 90; of this world, 68; no deceiver, 68, 70, 73
Church, 8, 9, 21, 42, 126, 129
Cicero, 19
Confessors, 8
Confirmation, 128
Confusion of substance, 108
Cornelius, 7 f.
Councils, 11, 12
Creation, 13 f., 21, 28, 31, 39, 41, 49, 53, 55, 62 ff., 69, 77, 94, 111, 129, 134
Creed, 12, 21, 74, 124. Cf. "Rule."
Cross, 91 f., 120, 131
Cyprian, 7 ff., 20

Death of Christ, 109 f.
Demiurge, 13, 25
Descent, 66 f., 79, 81, 107 f.
Development of faith, 38
Devil, 23, 94
Discord in man, 36
Distinction of natures, 108; of persons, 116, 121
Docetics, 48

"Economy," 38, 72, 83, 105, 108
Emmanuel, 57, 105
Emptied, 101
Eternity, 18, 26, 35, 39, 66, 73, 128, 134 f
Ethereal flesh, 50
Evacuating of Godhead, 104, 108
Evil, source of, 23, 31

Fabian, 7
Father, 13, 21, 49, 53, 82
Fear, 36, 41, 110
Figurative expressions, 41
Flesh, 14, 25, 50 ff., 61 ff., 67 f. 97, 100, 104 ff., 110, 128
Form of God, 99
Frailty, 53, 62, 66, 68, 81, 105
Free will, 23, 52, 56

Garment of flesh, 97
Gentiles, 125
Germane to the F., 135
Gifts of Spirit, 126
"Gnosis," 13, 25
Gnostics, 50 f.
God, above all, 25, 102; alone, 33; alone good, 31, 43, 133; boundless, 26, 79, 134; Creator, 21 ff., 28, 77; contains all, 25, 44, 79; changeless, 32; eternal, 26, 39, 134; Father, 43, 56, 82; greater than mind, 26, and language, 41; immortal, 26, 134; incomprehensible, 137; incorporeal, 36; incorruptible, 35, 110; infinite, 33; invisible, 84 f., 121, 134, 137; lawgiver, 23; no origin, 25, 134; not an angel, 82 ff.; omnipresent, 65; one, 46, 112, 116, 131 ff.; self-existent, 32; simple, 36, 39; spirit, 36, 38, 40; source, 28, 139; timeless, 26
"God died," 109
Gods, Hebrew use of, 71, 93 f.
Grace, 43, 127
"Gratiae," 126

Hagar, 82, 85
Harmony in universe, 25, 29, 104
Hebrews, Ep. to, 139
Holy Spirit, given through Christ, 43, 127; gifts to Christ, 127; One, 124; in prophets, 42; His work, 106 125 ff.; less than Christ, 73

"Holy thing," secondarily Son of God, 107
"Hypostasis," 40, 112

Image, of Christ, 81, 99, 121 f.; of man, 22, 78, 113
Imitator of God, 23, 95, 99, 121
Immanence, 25, 39, 79
"Immensus," 26, 45, 79, 134
Immortality, 24, 35, 39, 69 f., 110 f., 128, 134
Immutability, 32
Impassibility, 36, 110
Incomprehensible, 137
Inconceivability, 27, 34
Incorruptibility, 35, 110
Individuality, 115
Inferiority, 18, 73, 84, 91, 100, 113, 135
Infinity, 25, 33
Intermediate state, 24

Jacob's wrestling and Christ's, 46, 91
Jerome, 74
Jews, 67 f., 71, 90, 125
Judgement, 24, 31, 44, 48, 55, 93
Judges called gods, 71, 93

"Kenosis," 99

Language, weakness of, 26 ff., 38, 41
Law, 22 f., 26, 42, 49, 51 f, 62, 75, 95, 107, 112, 126, 129
"Legitimus," 107
Lie, 68, 70 f., 81
Loan, of humanity, 108
"Logos," 51

Man, 22 f., 35, 43, 49, 65, 69, 78, 110 f.
Marriage, 50
Mary, 50, 106
Master, 133
Material, 23 ff., 36, 44, 66, 97, 98
Mediator, 65, 96, 104, 139
Messianic hope, 46 ff.
Mind, cannot conceive God, 27, 34, 91
Mortality, 23, 32 f., 66, 71, 111
Moses called God, 94

Name God, 83 f., 93 f., 102, 112, 115
—— of Jesus, 99, 102
—— of God, 33 f.
Natural law, 45
Nature, 30, 52, 54 f.
Neuter gender, 115
Non-human Christ, 104
Novatian, 7 ff, 128.

Obedience, 19, 22 f., 100, 114, 118, 137
Order of power, 115
Origin, 25, 32, 70, 134 ff.
Originator, 28

Paraclete, 73, 124
Paradise, 42
Passions, 35 f.
Patripassians, 103
Peniel, 89
Person, 15, 51, 56, 83, 91, 99, 103, 105, 108, 112 f., 115 f., 127, 133, 136
Personality, 18, 49, 53, 100, 102, 112, 117, 135
Plural number, 116, 133
Prayer, 34, 65
Praxeas, 103
Predestination, 76
Procession, 69, 71, 96, 136
Progress in spiritual knowledge, 30, 38, 49, 68, 81, 119, 122, 128
Prophetic present, 120
Proportion, 104
"Prosopon," 112
Providence, 43 f.
"Pupillus," 126
Pure heart, 123
Puritans, 9

Reason of God, 51, 53
Repentance, 8

Resurrection, of Christ, 48, 51, 97, 100, 125; of man, 22, 36, 49, 128
"Robbery," 100, 136
Rule of faith or of truth, 12, 14, 21, 56, 74, 77, 95, 114, 129

Sabellius, 59 f., 103
"Sacramentum, 24, 46, 84, 92, 104, 108, 114, 126
Salvation, 23, 49 f., 52, 56 f., 65, 71, 90, 104, 128
Sanctification, 118, 128
Scripture, authority of, 11, 16, 56, 64, 71, 76, 78 f., 81, 88, 114, 130, 132 f.; anticipates, 120; limitations of, 34, 37, 44; guarded, 129; proportion, 104
Sects, 128
Seneca, 19
"Sermo," 51
Sidereal flesh, 50
Signs, 53, 58
Simple, 36, 39
Sin, 24, 41, 52
Socrates, 7
Son of Man, 62, 95, 105, 107 f.
Soul, immortal, 24, 110
Source, 127, 137 f.
Spirit, a creature, 41; in man, 45, 120; a step to higher thoughts, 40. The Holy, *see* "Holy Spirit," "Paraclete."
Stoics, 7, 13, 30, 45, 75
Subjection, 83, 92, 102, 115, 118, 137 f.
Subordination, 18
Substance, 36, 46, 50 ff., 76, 89, 97 f., 105 ff., 109 f., 112, 135 f.
"Superior God," 25
Super-personality, 19, 135

Temperance, 128
Tertullian, 9 ff., 15, 17, 103, 112
Testaments, mutually self-confirming, 41, 46 f., 49, 79, 114, 124
Timelessness, 26, 134
Tradition, 11, 13, 16, 130 ff.
Tree of life, 23, 42
Trinity, 31, 112
"Tutor," 126
"Two Gods," 131, 136
Two thieves, 131
Types fulfilled, 46

Unborn, 135, 138
Union of natures: called "alliance," 91, 96, 109 f.; "commingling," 107 f., 110; "communion," 139; "concord," 61, 96, 104, 109, 115 f.; "confederation," 96; "conjunction," 64, 74; "connexion," "binding together," 62, 96; "growing together," 109; "weaving together," 109
Unity, human, 116
Unoriginate, 25, 28

"Verbum," 51
"Vicinus," 135
Virgil, 19, 24 f.
Vocabulary, theological, 14

Washing of feet, 84
Will, of God, 18, 22, 38 f., 54, 83, 134, 137 f.; of man, 32, 52
Word. *See* Christ.

INDEX OF TEXTS

	PAGE
Gen. i. 14	22
i. 26 f.	78, 113
i. 31	31
ii. 9	42
iii. 5	23, 32
viii. 21	37
xi. 7	79
xii. 7	80
xvii. 8	46
xix. 24,	84, 113
xxi. 17	85
xxxi. 11	87
xxxii. 24	89
xlviii. 15	91
xlix. 10	46
xlix. 11	98
Ex. iii. 14	32 41
iv. 13	46
vii. 1	94
xxi. 6	93
xxxi. 18	37
xxxiii. 20	81
Deut. iv. 39	29
viii. 4	43
xviii. 15	46
xxviii. 66	47
xxxii. 8	80
2 Kings xix. 16	37
xix. 19	132
Ps. ii. 7	113
ii. 8	48
xix. 5	61
xxii. 16	120
xxxiv. 15	37
xlv. 1	60, 77
xlv. 7	127
lxviii. 17	45
lxix. 21	120
lxxii. 1	48
lxxx. 1	44

	PAGE
Ps. lxxxii. 1 ff.	93
civ. 24, 32	29
cx. 1	48, 113 f.
cxxxvi. 12	37
cxxxix. 8	37
Is. i. 20	37
vii. 14	47, 57, 105
viii. 3	120
viii. 10.	57
ix. 6	83, 95, 120
xi. 1	47
xi. 2	127
xi. 10	48
xxxv. 3	58
xxxv. 5	47
xl. 12	29, 132
xl. 22	29
xlii. 2	47
xlii. 8	29
xliv. 6	132
xlv. 1	60
xlv. 7	30
xlv. 18	29, 113
xlv. 21	132
liii. 5 f.	47
liii. 7	120
lv. 3 f.	47
lxi. 1.	127
lxv. 2	47, 120
lxvi. 1 f.	29, 37
Jer. xvii. 5	65 73
Ezek. i. 13 ff.	44
Dan. iii. 27	43
Hos. i. 7	56
vi. 3	48
Joel ii. 29	124
Amos iv. 11	84
Hab. iii. 3	59
Mal. iii. 6	32
Wisd. i. 7	44

	PAGE
Wisd. ii. 24	23
St. Matt. v. 8	123
x. 28	110
x. 29	43
xii. 32	129
xvi. 16	114
xix. 17	132 f.
xxii. 45	55
xxiii. 8	133
xxviii. 20	21
St. Mark xvi. 19	114
St. Luke i. 35	106
vi. 5	55
x. 22	114
xvi. 19	24
xviii. 19	31
xix. 10	23
xx. 38	111
St. John i. 1 ff.	61, 132
i. 3	61, 76, 95
i. 10	55, 61
i. 11	64
i. 14	51, 60, 64, 95, 105, 110, 132
i. 15	65
i. 18	86
ii. 19	95
iii. 8	41
iii. 13	61
iii. 31	64, 95
iii. 34	94
iv. 21	38
iv. 24	36
v. 19, 26	65
vi. 38	95, 113
vi. 46, 51, 62	66
viii. 14	67
viii. 17	114
viii. 23	68
viii. 42, 51	54, 69
viii. 58	55, 70
x. 18	95
x. 27	70
x. 30	62, 71, 115
x. 32, 36	72
x. 33	117
x. 34	93
x. 35	71
St. John xi. 26	72
xi. 42	114
xii. 28	114
xiv. 6 ff.	119
xiv. 12	119
xiv. 16	119, 125
xiv. 18	119
xiv. 23, 26	120
xiv. 28	55, 113, 121
xv. 1	122
xv. 9	122
xv. 15	122
xv. 21	122
xv. 26	122
xvi. 7, 13	125
xvii. 3	74, 114
xvii. 5	61, 75, 114
xx. 17	113
xx. 22	124
xx. 28	62, 132
Acts i. 21	21
i. 23	76
x. 34	21
Rom. i. 20	30
vii. 14	37
viii. 9	127
viii. 21	31
ix. 5	63, 132
xi. 33	45
xi. 36	30
1 Cor. ii. 9	41
ii. 12	129
iii. 6	116
vii. 40	129
viii. 1 ff.	13
xii. 3	129
xiv. 32	129
xv. 50	51
2 Cor. iii. 17	127
iv. 13	125
v. 2	97
xi. 16	21
xi. 31	63
Gal. i. 1	63
i. 12	63
iii. 20	132
iv. 4	55
v. 17	128

	PAGE
Gal. vi. 16	21
Eph. i. 3	63
iii. 2	38
iv. 10	80
v. 1	23
Phil. i. 6 ff.	99 ff.
Col. i. 15	81, 95, 96
i. 16	24, 61, 63, 65
ii. 11	97
ii. 15	97
iii. 9	97
1 Tim. i. 17	30
ii. 5	96, 139
1 Tim. iv. 1	129
vi. 16	81, 132
2 Tim. i. 11	133
i. 13	21
Heb. v. 7	140
1 St. Pet. i. 20	76
2 St. Pet. i. 4	70
1 St. John iii. 1	70
iii. 2	82
iv. 12	81
Rev. xix. 13	60
xxii. 18	76

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK ST., STAMFORD ST., S.E. 1,
AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

S.P.C.K.
BOOKS FOR STUDENTS

Translations of Early Documents

A Series of texts important for the study of Christian origins. Under the Joint Editorship of the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., and the Rev. Canon G. H. Box, M.A.

The object of this Series is to provide short, cheap, and handy textbooks for students, either working by themselves or in classes. The aim is to furnish in translations important texts unencumbered by commentary or elaborate notes, which can be had in larger works.

EXTRACTS FROM PRESS NOTICES.

The Times Literary Supplement says: "These Jewish Apocalypses have a direct relation to the thought and religious ideals which confronted primitive Christianity in Palestine, and not only for their own sakes, but for their influence on the New Testament and Apostolic Christianity they deserve careful attention. Handbooks at once so scholarly and so readable will be welcomed by all interested in Christian origins."

The Church Quarterly Review says: "To the theological student who is anxious to know something of the circumstances and thought of the time during which Christianity grew up, and of the Jewish environment of the teaching of our Lord and the Apostles, there is no class of books more valuable than the later Jewish Apocrypha."

The Church Times says: "The names of the Editors are a guarantee of trustworthy and expert scholarship, and their work has been admirably performed."

The Tablet says: "A valuable series . . . well brought out and should prove useful to students."

Catholic Book Notes says: "The S.P.C.K. is to be congratulated on its various series of cheap and useful books for students."

Translations of Early Documents

FIRST SERIES—Palestinian-Jewish and Cognate Texts (Pre-Rabbinic)

1. **Jewish Documents in the Time of Ezra**
   Translated from the Aramaic by A. E. COWLEY, Litt.D., Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library, Oxford. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

2. **The Wisdom of Ben-Sira (Ecclesiasticus)**
   By the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., Vicar of St. Alban's, Bedford Park, W.; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

3. **The Book of Enoch**
   By the Rev. R. H. CHARLES, D.D., Canon of Westminster. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

4. **The Book of Jubilees**
   By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. 4*s.* net.

5. **The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs**
   By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

6. **The Odes and Psalms of Solomon**
   By the Rev. G. H. BOX, M.A., Rector of Sutton, Beds., Hon. Canon of St. Albans.

7. **The Ascension of Isaiah**
   By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. Together with No. 10 in one volume. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

8. **The Apocalypse of Ezra (ii. Esdras)**
   By the Rev. Canon BOX. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

9. **The Apocalypse of Baruch**
   By the Rev. Canon CHARLES. Together with No. 12 in one volume. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

10. **The Apocalypse of Abraham**
    By the Rev. Canon BOX. Together with No. 7 in one volume. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

11. **The Testaments of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob**
By the Rev. Canon Box and S. Gazelee.

12. **The Assumption of Moses**
By Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, East Finchley. With No. 9 in one volume. *2s. 6d.* net.

13. **The Biblical Antiquities of Philo**
By M. R. James, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Litt.D., Dublin, Hon. LL.D., St. Andrews, Provost of King's College, Cambridge. *8s. 6d.* net.

14. **Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament**
By M. R. James, Litt.D.

SECOND SERIES—Hellenistic-Jewish Texts

1. **The Wisdom of Solomon**
By the Rev. Dr. Oesterley. *2s. 6d.* net.

2. **The Sibylline Oracles (Books iii-v)**
By the Rev. H. N. Bate, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, W.; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. *3s. 6d.* net.

3. **The Letter of Aristeas**
By H. St. John Thackeray, M.A., King's College, Cambridge. *2s. 6d.* net.

4. **Selections from Philo**
By J. H. A. Hart, M.A.

5. **Selections from Josephus**
By H. St. J. Thackeray, M.A.

6. **The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees**
By the Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D., Vicar of West Hendred, Berks. *3s. 6d.* net.

7. **The Book of Joseph and Asenath**
Translated from the Greek text (for the first time in English) by E. W. Brooks. *2s. 6d.* net.

THIRD SERIES—Palestinian-Jewish and Cognate Texts (Rabbinic)

*1. Pirqe Aboth. By the Rev. Dr. Oesterley.
*2. Berakhoth. By the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, D.D.
*3. Yoma. By the Rev. Canon Box.
*4. Shabbath. By the Rev. Dr. Oesterley.
*5. Sanhedrin. By the Rev. H. Danby. 6*s.* net.
*6. Kimhi's Commentary on the Psalms (Book I, Selections). By the Rev. R. G. Finch, B.D. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

7. Tamid
8. Aboda Zara
9. Middoth
10. Sopherim
11. Megilla
12. Sukka
13. Taanith
14. Megillath Taanith

* It is proposed to publish these texts first by way of experiment. If the Series should so far prove successful the others will follow.

Jewish Literature and Christian Origins:

Vol. I. The Apocalyptic Literature.
,, II. A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical Judaism.

By the Revs. Dr. Oesterley and Canon Box.

Jewish Uncanonical Writings: A Popular Introduction. By the Rev. W. J. Ferrar. 3*s.* net.

Handbooks of Christian Literature

The Early Christian Books. By the Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Eucharistic Office of the Book of Common Prayer. By the Rev. Leslie Wright, M.A., B.D. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture. By the Rev. G. D. Barry, B.D. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Letters of St. Augustine. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D.

Translations of Christian Literature

A NUMBER of translations from the Fathers have already been published by the S.P.C.K. under the title "Early Church Classics." It is now proposed to enlarge this series to include texts which are neither "early" nor necessarily "classics." The divisions at present proposed are given below. Volumes belonging to the original series are marked with an asterisk.

The Month says: "The cheap and useful series."
The Church Times says: "The splendid series."

SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS.

St. Dionysius the Areopagite: The Divine Names and the Mystical Theology. By C. E. ROLT.

The Library of Photius. By J. H FREESE. In 6 Vols.

The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes. By T. W. CRAFER, D.D.

***The Epistle of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome.** By the Rt. Rev. J. A. F. GREGG, D.D. *1s. 3d.* net.

***Clement of Alexandria: Who is the Rich Man that is being saved?** By P. M. BARNARD, B.D. *1s. 3d.* net.

***St. Chrysostom: On the Priesthood.** By T. A. MOXON. *2s.* net.

***The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles.** By C. BIGG, D.D. *1s. 3d.* net.

***The Epistle to Diognetus.** By the Rt. Rev. L. B. RADFORD, D.D. *1s. 6d.* net.

St. Dionysius of Alexandria. By C. L. FELTOE, D.D. *3s. 6d.* net.

***The Epistle of the Gallican Churches: Lugdunum and Vienna.** With an Appendix containing Tertullian's Address to Martyrs and the Passion of St. Perpetua. By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. *1s. 3d.* net.

***St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Catechetical Oration.** By the Ven. J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. *2s.* net.

***St. Gregory of Nyssa: The Life of St. Macrina.** By W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, B.D. *1s. 3d.* net.

***Gregory Thaumaturgus (Origen the Teacher): the Address of Gregory to Origen, with Origen's Letter to Gregory.** By W. METCALFE, B.D. *1s. 6d.* net.

***The Shepherd of Hermas.** By C. TAYLOR, D.D. 2 vols. *2s.* each net.

SERIES I.—GREEK TEXTS (*continued*).

The Epistles of St. Ignatius. By the Ven. J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. *3s. 6d.* net.

***St. Irenaeus: Against the Heresies.** By F. R. M. HITCHCOCK, D.D. 2 vols. *2s.* each net.

Palladius: The Lausiac History. By W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, B.D. *5s.* net.

***St. Polycarp.** By B. JACKSON. *1s. 3d.* net.

SERIES II.—LATIN TEXTS.

Tertullian's Treatises concerning Prayer, concerning Baptism. By A. SOUTER, Litt.D. *3s.* net.

Tertullian against Praxeas. By A. SOUTER, Litt.D.

Novatian on the Trinity. By H. MOORE.

***St. Augustine: The City of God.** By F. R. M. HITCHCOCK, D.D. *1s. 6d.* net.

***St. Cyprian: The Lord's Prayer.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. *1s. 6d.* net.

Minucius Felix: The Octavius. By J. H. FREESE. *3s. 6d.* net.

***Tertullian: On the Testimony of the Soul and On the Prescription of Heretics.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. *2s.* net.

***St. Vincent of Lerins: The Commonitory.** By T. H. BINDLEY, D.D. *2s.* net.

SERIES III.—LITURGICAL TEXTS.

EDITED BY C. L. FELTOE, D.D.

St. Ambrose: On the Mysteries and on the Sacraments. By T. THOMPSON, B.D., and J. H. SRAWLEY, D.D. *4s. 6d.* net.

***The Apostolic Constitution and Cognate Documents, with special reference to their Liturgical elements.** By DE LACY O'LEARY, D.D. *1s. 3d.* net.

***The Liturgy of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitution, commonly called the Clementine Liturgy.** By R. H. CRESSWELL. *1s. 6d.* net.

The Pilgrimage of Etheria. By M. L. MCCLURE. *6s.* net.

***Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book.** By the Rt. Rev. J. WORDSWORTH, D.D. *1s. 6d.* net.

(*Other series in contemplation*)

Helps for Students of History

Edited by

C. JOHNSON, M.A., and J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

The American Historical Review says: "A most useful little series of pamphlets."

The Times Educational Supplement says: "These little volumes by well-known specialists should be in the hands of serious students of history."

1. **Episcopal Registers of England and Wales.** By R. C. FOWLER, B.A., F.S.A. 6*d.* net.
2. **Municipal Records.** By F. J. C. HEARNSHAW, M.A. 6*d.* net.
3. **Medieval Reckonings of Time.** By REGINALD L. POOLE, LL.D., Litt.D. 6*d.* net.
4. **The Public Record Office.** By C. JOHNSON, M.A. 6*d.* net.
5. **The Care of Documents.** By C. JOHNSON, M.A. 6*d.* net.
6. **The Logic of History.** By C. G. CRUMP. 8*d.* net.
7. **Documents in the Public Record Office, Dublin.** By R. H. MURRAY, Litt.D. 8*d.* net.
8. **The French Wars of Religion.** By ARTHUR A. TILLEY, M.A. 6*d.* net.

By Sir A. W. WARD, Litt.D., F.B.A.

9. **The Period of Congresses—I. Introductory.** 8*d.* net.
10. **The Period of Congresses—II. Vienna and the Second Peace of Paris.** 1*s.* net.
11. **The Period of Congresses—III. Aix-la-Chapelle to Verona.** 1*s.* net.

Nos. 9, 10, and 11 in one volume, cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

12. **Securities of Peace: A Retrospect (1848–1914).** Paper, 2*s.* net; cloth, 3*s.* net.

---

13. **The French Renaissance.** By A. A. TILLEY, M.A. 8*d.* net.
14. **Hints on the Study of English Economic History.** By Archdeacon W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., F.B.A., F.S.A. 8*d.* net.
15. **Parish History and Records.** By A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A. 8*d.* net.
16. **A Short Introduction to the Study of Colonial History.** By A. P. NEWTON, M.A., D.Lit. 6*d.* net.

Texts for Students

General Editors: CAROLINE A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit.; H. J. WHITE, D.D.; J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

The English Historical Review says: "A new series which deserves mention . . . every number is the work of a scholar of acknowledged competence."

Catholic Book Notes says: "The S.P.C.K. has rendered a service to Education . . . It is to be hoped that these texts will find their way into our colleges: they will give a new meaning to Latin and history."

1. **Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius,** illustrative of Christianity in the First Century. Arranged by H. J. WHITE, D.D. Paper cover, 3*d*. net.

2. **Selections from Matthew Paris.** By C. A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit. Paper cover, 9*d*. net.

3. **Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis.** By C. A. J. SKEEL, D.Lit. Paper cover, 9*d*. net.

4. **Libri Sancti Patricii.** The Latin Writings of St. Patrick, etc. Edited by NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. Paper cover, 6*d*. net.

5. **A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick.** By NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. Paper cover, 6*d*. net.

6. **Selections from the Vulgate.** Paper cover, 9*d*. net.

7. **The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome.** Paper cover, 6*d*. net.

8. **Select Extracts from Chronicles and Records relating to English Towns in the Middle Ages.** Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by F. J. C. HEARNSHAW, M.A., LL.D. Paper cover, 9*d*. net.

9. **The Inscription on the Stele of Méša.** Commonly called the Moabite Stone. The text in Moabite and Hebrew, with translation by the Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A. Paper cover, 6*d*. net.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
LONDON: 6 ST. MARTIN'S PLACE, W.C. 2
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
5.7.19.]

BT110 .N6813 1919

Novatianus.

The treatise of Novatian On
the Trinity

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00079551
C0-BWK-848